The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXVI, No. 5 May, 1952

CONTENTS

The Centennial of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, *John Tracy Ellis* 321

The Moral Price of Interschool Athletics, *Thomas C. Donlan, O.P.* 351

Jean Jacques Olier and Devotion to Mary, *Robert Paul Mohan, S.S.* 366

A Quest of Thoughts. Part V . . . . *John K. Ryan* 370

Recent Works in Fundamental Dogmatic Theology, *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 374

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Devotional Electric Lights 381

The New Rules on Fast and Abstinence 382

Organ Regulations 386

Oratio imperata 387

Public and Private Mass 387

Athanasian Creed 387

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Flowers on the Altar 388

Rosary Devotions 388

Stations of the Cross 388

ANALECTA 390

BOOK REVIEWS

Depth Psychology, Morality, and Alcoholism, *by John C. Ford, S.J.* 396

Fighting Admiral. The Story of Dan Callaghan, *by Francis X. Murphy, C.SS.R.* 398

Father Luigi Gentili and His Mission, *by Denis Gwynn* 398

God and Man at Yale, *by William F. Buckley, Jr.* 399

The Marianum

A Quarterly Review of Scientific Mariology

Rev. Gabriel M. Roschini, O.S.M., Editor

- ***THE MARIANUM* is the oldest and foremost quarterly review of Mariology.**
- **It is a polygot publication, having departments for Specific Questions in Mariology, Church Documents, Current Mariological Events, Book Reviews, etc.**
- **Articles for THE MARIANUM are written by the leading mariologists all over the world.**
- **NO STUDENT OF MARIOLOGY SHOULD BE WITHOUT IT!**

Subscription price, payable in U. S. money or equivalent, for United States, Canada, and the Sterling Area: $4.00 annually; $10.00 for three years. Address subscription communications to: American Province of Servite Fathers, 3111 Van Buren Street, Chicago 12, Illinois, or directly to Servite Fathers, International Marian Commission, Via Del Corso 255-A, Rome, Italy.

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE FIRST PLENARY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE

On Sunday, May 9, 1852, there took place in the Cathedral of the Assumption in Baltimore the formal opening of the First Plenary Council of the Catholic Church in the United States. Over twenty-two years had elapsed since that day in October, 1829, when Archbishop James Whitfield and five of his suffragans had assembled in the same cathedral for the First Provincial Council of the American bishops. In the interval six other provincial councils had been held in Baltimore and at the last one, in May, 1849, the prelates had petitioned the Holy See for the erection of three new ecclesiastical provinces, namely, Cincinnati, New Orleans, and New York.[1] On July 19, 1850, Rome had responded favorably to this petition by erecting the three provinces so that, with Oregon City and St. Louis having been created metropolitan sees several years before, it became necessary to broaden the base of the next conciliar gathering of the American hierarchy to that of a plenary character.

Before the council of 1849 disbanded the prelates had decided to seek the permission of Rome to hold a plenary council and the subject, therefore, had been on their minds during the intervening period. Archbishop John Hughes of New York had discussed the question of a national council on his visit to the Holy See early in 1851, and the day before he sailed from Liverpool for home in June of that year he urged Bernard Smith, O.S.B., professor of theology in the Urban College of the Propaganda Fide and Vice Rector of the Irish College in Rome, to do what he could to hasten the Holy See's appointment of a prelate to take charge of the necessary preparations. As Hughes reminded his Benedictine friend, the American bishops lived at great distances from each other and a good deal of time would be needed for proper consultation on a project of such vast scope.[2] But it was Francis Patrick

---

[1] Peter Guilday, *A History of the Councils of Baltimore (1791-1884)* (New York, 1932), pp. 156-57. This work is the only general account of the conciliar activities of the American hierarchy.

[2] Department of Archives and Manuscripts of The Catholic University of America, Smith Papers, Hughes to "Revd. dear Friend," Liverpool, June 9, 1851, microfilm. Hereafter this depository will be designated as CUA. The

Kenrick, the Archbishop of Baltimore, who would have to assume the principal burden of preparations on this side of the Atlantic after Pope Pius IX had appointed him as apostolic delegate for the council on Aug. 29, 1851, and it was Kenrick, too, upon whom there would devolve the duty of acting as host to the American hierarchy and their theologians in his see city.[3]

Archbishop Kenrick began his preliminary plans months in advance and on November 21 he issued the formal letter of convocation to his fellow bishops and set May 9 of the following year as the opening date of the council.[4] On the same day he issued a pastoral letter to the priests and people of the Archdiocese of Baltimore in which he informed them of the coming event, asked their prayers for its success, and told them:

> The object for which this Council is summoned, is by wise enactments and measures to promote discipline, and enforce the sacred Canons, or to submit

---

need for mutual consultation was expressed by Bishop John J. Chanche, S.S., of Natchez to Archbishop John B. Purcell of Cincinnati three weeks before the council opened. He was anticipating a visit to Cincinnati before the council and he remarked, "I do feel the necessity of talking to you so much about matters & things—The Archb. of New Orleans, too, feels the same cravings." (Archives of the Diocese of Natchez, Chanche to Purcell, Natchez, April 14, 1852, photostat of original from the Cincinnati Papers in the Archives of the University of Notre Dame.) The writer is indebted to the kindness of the Most Reverend Richard O. Gerow, Bishop of Natchez, for typed copies made from these photostats in the archives at Natchez. Hereafter this archives will be referred to as ADN.

[3] Some weeks before the council Kenrick told his brother, the Archbishop of St. Louis, "Up to the present time I have not determined where to lodge the priests; but perhaps the faithful may offer them lodging." Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, March 20, 1852, in [Francis E. Tourscher, O.S.A., (Ed.)], *The Kenrick-Frenaye Correspondence . . . 1830-1862* (Philadelphia, 1920), p. 331. The papal brief appointing Kenrick as apostolic delegate is printed in Donald C. Shearer, O.F.M.Cap., *Pontificia Americana* (Washington, 1933), pp. 270-72. There is a discrepancy in the sources on the date of this document. In *Concilium plenarium totius Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae Baltimori habitum anno 1852* (Baltimore, 1853), p. 4, it is given as August 19, and so also in Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 172. However, Shearer, *op. cit.*, p. 272, gives August 29 which he took from Raphaëlis de Martinis (Ed.), *Iuris pontificii de Propaganda Fide*, (Rome, 1894), VI (Pars prima), 122.

[4] Archives of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, 32B-Z-1, "Acta episcopalia," p. 53. The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the Reverend Paul L. Love, Archivist of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, for his generous assistance in helping to locate items for this article. Hereafter this archives will be designated as AAB.

such modifications of them as local circumstances may require, to the mature and enlightened judgment of the chief bishop, who is divinely charged with the solicitude of all the churches.[5]

All through the winter and early spring of 1852 Kenrick continued to keep in close touch with his colleagues in the hierarchy, and his correspondence was especially heavy during these months with his brother, Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick of St. Louis,[6] and with close friends like Bishops Martin J. Spalding of Louisville and John Timon, C.M., of Buffalo. After Bishop John B. Fitzpatrick of Boston had declined to preach the sermon at the customary requiem for the bishops who had died since the council of 1849, Kenrick turned to Spalding. He remarked that Fitzpatrick had begged off for the reason that he had not known the deceased prelates well enough, and especially, added Kenrick, "the venerable Flaget who ought to be the main subject of the panegyric." Benedict J. Flaget, S.S., the pioneer bishop of the Middle West who had ruled the See of Bardstown (Louisville) from 1811 to his death in February, 1850, would, indeed, be the principal figure to be treated in any sermon dealing with the prelates who had died since they had last assembled. Referring to the explanation given for Fitzpatrick's refusal, Kenrick stated, "You cannot put in that plea; so waiving all excuse, please prepare for that grand occasion." He went on to say that in the coming council they must consider the necessity for new dioceses and it was his belief that Boston and Philadelphia should be made metropolitan sees, while he quoted the Bishop of Boston as having indicated his desire that new dioceses be established at Burlington, Vermont, and Portland, Maine.[7]

As the weeks passed Kenrick gradually completed his choices for the various conciliar offices and functions. In the councils of 1843, 1846, and 1849 the Sulpician Bishop of Natchez, John J. Chanche, had acted, along with Bishop Michael Portier of Mobile, as the promoters. But when Kenrick asked Chanche to serve once again in that capacity the latter remembered an objection that had been raised by Peter Kenrick of St. Louis at an earlier council to the promoterships being held by two bishops. Therefore, before he replied he consulted his own metropolitan, Archbishop Antoine Blanc of New Orleans.[8] Only after having received assurances that Portier no longer wished to fill the office and that Kenrick would explain the arrangement he had in mind to the Bishop of Mobile, did Chanche give his consent. As he told Blanc, "I think now, I can say no more. If any objection is raised, it must be the Prelates at the Council. I have acted with all the delicacy which the circumstances require."[9]

---

[5] CUA, Guilday Collection, a printed copy of Kenrick's pastoral letter of Nov. 21, 1851.

[6] For an English translation of the Latin letters of Francis to Peter Kenrick on council business from Dec. 24, 1851, to Dec. 30, 1853, cf. Tourscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 320-362.

[7] AAB, 34-J-14, Kenrick to Spalding, Baltimore, Jan. 21, 1852, copy.

In the course of his correspondence with Kenrick on the subject of the promotership Chanche took occasion to say that he believed that the council ought to last more than a week and he emphasized, too, that the bishops should agree on a unified mode of action in dealing with secret societies. He then added, "Would it be proper that the national council should repeat the request of the last Provincial Council with regard to the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin?"[10] In 1849 the bishops had petitioned the Holy See to make a doctrinal pronouncement on the Immaculate Conception, and it was this action to which the Bishop of Natchez was referring.[11] A copy of the Archbishop of Baltimore's reply could not be found, but a few weeks later

---

[8] ADN, Chanche to Blanc, Natchez, Jan. 24 and Feb. 7, 1852, copies.

[9] *Ibid.*, same to same, Natchez, March 13, 1852, copy; AAB, 28-G-4, Chanche to Kenrick, Natchez, Feb. 3, 1852; 28-G-5, same to same, Natchez, March 15, 1852. Chanche summarized the negotiations over the promotership to the Archbishop of Cincinnati and he remarked, "I shall have this office by prescription if the Prelates don't take care" (ADN, Chanche to Purcell, Natchez, March 15, 1852, copy).

[10] AAB, 28-G-4, Chanche to Kenrick, Natchez, Feb. 3, 1852.

[11] According to the official record of the first public congregation of May 7, 1849, Archbishop Samuel Eccleston, S.S., sought the opinions of the theologians as to the desirability of petitioning the Holy See for a definition of the doctrine. *Concilia provincialia Baltimori habita ab anno 1829 usque ad annum 1849* (Baltimore, 1851), p. 270. Later in the council there were enacted two decrees relating to this subject. The first was in response to a request of Pius IX of Feb. 2, 1849, asking for information concerning the attitude of their people toward the Immaculate Conception, in which the bishops declared that there was a strong devotion among American Catholics to the Virgin Mary under this title; in the second decree it was stated that the bishops would be very gratified if the Pontiff were to define the doctrine if in his judgment it were thought opportune (*Ibid.*, pp. 277-78).

Chanche expressed himself to Kenrick as satisfied to leave the subject of the Immaculate Conception off the agenda.[12] In a letter of the same day to Archbishop John B. Purcell of Cincinnati Chanche revealed something of what lay behind his decision not to press the matter. He said:

> I think with you, it is better to say nothing more on the subject of the Immaculate Conception. We have expressed our opinion & our wishes to the Holy See with sufficient clearness. Besides any further action on the subject might wound the feelings of those who dissented.[13]

Apparently there had been opposition from some of the bishops when the petition was voted upon three years before.

It was natural that the apostolic delegate should be particularly anxious to have the opening sermon at the first solemn session of the council set the tone for their deliberations, and for this important task he first turned to Bishop John McCloskey of Albany. McCloskey's reply could not be found but in all likelihood he declined out of deference to his own metropolitan, the Archbishop of New York.[14] Not only was it fitting that the great See of New York should thus be honored, but John Hughes enjoyed at that time the best reputation in the hierarchy for pulpit eloquence. Upon receipt of Kenrick's invitation Hughes remarked that he had seen nothing to be added to the topics proposed in the preliminary schema for the council which he had recently received and, as for the sermon, he would be willing to undertake the assignment. "I understand it, however," he said, "as an awful responsibility—and I shall arrange my thoughts in regard to it in such a manner, that it will be impossible to refer *hereafter* to any thing said at the first National Council, except as going to strengthen the bonds of the Catholic Unity, as tested by eternal devotion to the See of Peter." The Archbishop of New York then gave the apostolic delegate the benefit of some comments that he had picked up in Rome the previous year. He had found the officials at the Congregation of the Propaganda annoyed at the American bishops over the increasing flow of requests for dispensations of one kind or another that had been reaching them of recent years from the United States. They had likewise complained that in former American councils the "censuerunt Patres" had been presented in too naked a form and had not carried a brief outline of the reasons and motives of the bishops for the views they had advanced on many questions. These were reflections that might be considered with profit, although the lack of cordiality that for some years had marked the relations between the two archbishops probably deprived them of some of the cogency they might have enjoyed had they emanated from another source.[15]

---

[12] AAB, 28-G-5, Chanche to Kenrick, Natchez, March 15, 1852.

[13] ADN, Chanche to Purcell, Natchez, March 15, 1852, copy.

[14] Archives of the Archdiocese of New York, Kenrick to Hughes, Baltimore, March 1, 1852. Hereafter this archives will be designated as AANY. Over three months before Kenrick communicated with Hughes he had told his brother in St. Louis, "I have invited the Bishop of Albany to give the opening address in the Council . . . ." (Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Nov. 24, 1851, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, p. 329). No reply of McCloskey to Kenrick could be found in the AAB.

Knowledge of the forthcoming council at Baltimore had reached Ireland by the early spring and Paul Cullen, Archbishop of Armagh, sent his greetings to the American hierarchy through Kenrick and wished the latter to assure them that the Irish Catholics would be forever grateful for the assistance the Americans had given to the Catholic University of Ireland. Cullen felt they would be glad to learn that the plan for a university in Dublin was making headway. Those were dark days in Ireland when the devastating effects of the potato famine of the late 1840's were still keenly felt. The Archbishop of Armagh and his colleagues of the Irish hierarchy were deeply concerned, as he said, over the wholesale emigration that was taking place among their people and the frightful condition in which so many of these unfortunates were leaving their homeland. With the approaching council at Baltimore in mind he told the apostolic delegate:

---

[15] AAB, 29-I-1, Hughes to Kenrick, New York, March 15, 1852. Apparently Hughes' suggestion on the last point was not heeded, for nearly a year later Kenrick informed his brother that he had been told by Giacomo Cardinal Fransoni, Prefect of Propaganda, and Bishop John McGill of Richmond that the Roman congregation wished, as he expressed it, "to have more detailed information on the reasons which move us to ask for the erection of new sees, and the merits of the men named" (Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Jan. 18, 1853, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, p. 347). For the earlier differences between Kenrick and Hughes cf. Hugh J. Nolan, *The Most Reverend Francis Patrick Kenrick, Third Bishop of Philadelphia, 1830-1851* (Washington, 1948), pp. 202 ff. and John R. G. Hassard, *Life of the Most Reverend John Hughes, First Archbishop of New York* (New York, 1866), pp. 144 ff.

> Should you or the other Prelates think it well to propose any measures to us regarding the innumerable emigrants now flying from this unhappy land, it would afford us great pleasure to receive and act on your suggestions. Direct and frequent communication upon this and other important matters between the Prelates of the two countries where their interests are common, might be the means of impeding many of the evils, to which our poor exiles are subjected whilst flying from their native land.[16]

But by the time this letter reached him Kenrick's hands were more than full and neither the meager records of the sessions nor the decrees of the council gave any indication that the subject of the Irish immigrants was discussed in May, 1852.

By the last days of April the final schema for the council was in the hands of the bishops, as John N. Neumann, C.SS.R., newly consecrated a month before by Kenrick himself as fourth Bishop of Philadelphia, informed the latter.[17] Only a few important matters concerning the organization of the gathering remained to be settled, and one of these was the place to be given to the superiors of the religious orders and congregations. It was a question that worried Bishop Michael O'Connor of Pittsburgh and, although he made it clear that he was willing to abide by whatever the Holy See might direct, he set forth his views at some length. He said:

---

[16] AAB, 28-T-3, Cullen to Kenrick, Drogheda, April 19, 1852. There are no copies of Kenrick's replies to Cullen in the AAB. Cullen was transferred from Armagh to Dublin less than two weeks after this letter was written. At this time John Henry Newman was getting ready to cross to Ireland to deliver his famous series of lectures on university education. On the very day of Cullen's letter Newman, writing from the Oratory in Birmingham, told his friend, Thomas W. Allies, "I am going to Ireland every day . . . ." Cf. Fergal McGrath, S.J., *Newman's University. Idea and Reality* (New York, 1951), p. 151. Newman crossed on May 7 and delivered his first lecture in the Rotunda at Dublin on May 10, the day after the council opened in Baltimore (*Ibid.*, pp. 152-53).

Cullen had given attention to the subject of Irish immigration to the United States soon after his consecration at Rome in February, 1850. He had been commissioned by the Holy See to convene a plenary council in Ireland, the first since 1642. It opened at Thurles on August 22 and lasted until Sept. 9, 1850. About six weeks in advance of the Irish national council the Archbishop of Armagh acknowledged Kenrick's congratulations on his promotion and he stated, "I would be particularly obliged if you would give me any hints regarding our synod. You see so many of our poor people in America, that you must know what their wants are, better than we do. It would be most useful for me to know what your experience in America is regarding mixed colleges and mixed education in general" (AAB, 28-T-2, Cullen to Kenrick, Drogheda, July 5, 1850). On the action taken by the Irish bishops at Thurles on the subject of education cf. McGrath, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-77.

[17] AAB, 30-U-6, Neumann to Kenrick, Philadelphia, April 29, 1852.

> I think we should guard carefully against our feeble hierarchy being swamped by the number and influence of the religious orders which are not of natural growth in the country. They are rather organizations encouraged and blown into life by influences from abroad who did not wish to work through the regular authorities, than the material growth and expression of the piety of the country.[18]

O'Connor was inclined to believe that abbots and provincials had a right to sit in the council, but of this he was not certain. In the sequel the single abbot in the United States at the time was accorded only a consultative vote in the morning private congregations at which he sat with the bishops, and the eleven other religious superiors of various ranks were permitted to cast a consultative vote on proposed legislation at the afternoon public congregations.[19]

A week before the date set for the formal opening the *Catholic Mirror* of Baltimore carried an editorial on May 1 in which it spoke of the signally favored position of the American Church which was free to hold councils at will, unlike the Church in some other countries. The progress of Catholicism in the United States during the first half of the nineteenth century was emphasized and the editorial writer then stated:

> What a contrast between the meeting of Catholic prelates at Baltimore, in 1810, consisting of the venerable Carroll, with his coadjutor and three other bishops, and the council that is to assemble a few days hence. What an expansion of the Church, even since the first provincial council in 1829, at which only six prelates and fourteen priests assisted.

The following week the *Catholic Mirror* noted in its issue of May 8 the fact that Archbishop Francis N. Blanchet of Oregon City, the farthest removed from Baltimore, had been among the first to arrive. Bishop Maurice de Saint-Palais of Vincennes was in Europe and would not attend, but the *Catholic Mirror* reported it as probable that Archbishop William Walsh of Halifax and Bishop Armand F.-M. de Charbonnel, S.S., of Toronto, who were expected to be visitors in the city, would be there. But the chief interest of the writer in the council's personnel was reserved for

---

[18] *Ibid.*, 30-W-9, O'Connor to Kenrick, Pittsburgh, April 19, 1852. O'Connor was certainly no enemy of the religious, for he had wished in his younger years to become a Jesuit and in May, 1860, he made good that desire by resigning his see and entering the Society of Jesus.

[19] *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 26-27.

Abbot Maria Euthropius Proust, O.C.S.O., of the Abbey of Our Lady of Gethsemani near New Haven, Kentucky, who had been blessed the previous October as the first mitred abbot in the United States and who was scheduled to appear. Apparently the *Mirror's* reporter found bishops in Baltimore a commonplace sight, but a mitred abbot in 1852 was still a curiosity to many American Catholic eyes.

At last all was in readiness and on Sunday morning, May 9, the solemn procession of the participating prelates and clergy moved from the archbishop's residence on Charles Street along Mulberry Street and into the cathedral. The procession was headed by students from St. Mary's Seminary who acted as acolytes, after whom came the theologians and the minor conciliar officers to the total of about sixty priests, followed by twenty-five bishops, the five archbishops, and finally Archbishop Kenrick, the apostolic delegate, and his chaplains. The music of the Mass, that of Mozart's Mass No. 12, was sung by the cathedral choir who were not only accompanied by the organ but by the Germania Band which added a further touch of pomp to the occasion. The Mass was celebrated by Kenrick and the sermon was preached by Hughes who took for his text the discourse of our Lord to His disciples wherein He described Himself as the door to the sheepfold and the good shepherd (*John* 10: 1-16). "If there was any thing," said the Archbishop of New York, "that seemed to press on the heart of the divine Redeemer more than another, it was the unity of the disciples." The preacher then went on to show how, in spite of the variety of races and tongues embraced within the Church, its children had remained through the centuries united in one faith. Near the end of his sermon the archbishop referred to the prelates gathered before him for the council about to open, and he remarked, "They meet here as the early Apostles met. They meet as brethren, to examine into the affairs of the Church; and when the proper time comes . . . in the joint name of the Holy Ghost and themselves, they promulgate the decisions."[20]

---

[20] The full text of the sermon was published by Lawrence Kehoe in his edition of the *Complete Works of the Most Rev. John Hughes, Archbishop of New York* (New York, 1865). The quoted passages may be found in II, 193, 197. The *Catholic Mirror* of May 15, 1852, apologized for giving only excerpts since the reporter upon whom they were counting ran off to Washington before he had fully transcribed his notes.

Following the Mass and sermon the list of the principal officials of the council was read and it included Bishop Chanche and François Lhomme, S.S., Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, as promoters with Edward L. Damphoux, S.S., as notary, and the secretaries were to be Patrick N. Lynch, Vicar General of the Diocese of Charleston, and Thomas Foley, Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, both destined to be future bishops. The man chosen for the office of master of ceremonies was Francis Burlando, C.M., and the cantors were announced as Louis de Goesbriand, Vicar General of the Diocese of Cleveland who within a year and a half was to be named first Bishop of Burlington, and Mr. John Dougherty, a student of St. Mary's Seminary, who was ordained the following year as a priest of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Bishops John Martin Henni of Milwaukee and Joseph Cretin of St. Paul arrived several days after the formal opening of the council so that ultimately there were six archbishops, twenty-seven bishops, including de Charbonnel of Toronto, one abbot, and fifty-eight priests who participated in the sessions that occupied the next ten days.

What were the events that were highlighting the American scene in the period that the bishops chose for their first plenary council? At the time Millard Fillmore, a Whig, was President of the United States and the nation had reached a total population of 23,191,876 in the census of 1850. Only four years before the country had come through the excitement that had attended the discovery of gold in California and the acquisition of a new imperial domain wrested from Mexico after a brief war that had terminated in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in February, 1848. The first women's rights convention had met the same year at Seneca Falls, New York, and American audiences were to hear much in the days ahead from female reformers like Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, while in another sector of the reform front Maine had passed its famous prohibition law in 1851. The expansion of the nation was mirrored in the accelerated pace of railroad construction after Congress had adopted the policy of liberal land grants for that purpose in 1850. The State of Illinois, for example, had been the recent recipient of a bountiful grant with which the Illinois Central Railroad was soon under construction, and by June, 1851, the Erie Railroad had reached Dunkirk, New York, to win the honor of being the first railway to make connections with the Great Lakes. But the bishops of the Far and Middle West were not served on their journey to the council by the pioneer Baltimore and Ohio since it did not reach Wheeling, Virginia (West Virginia), until Christmas of 1853.

The question that overshadowed all others, however, in the period immediately before the calling of the council was that of slavery. The startling growth of California that followed the discovery of gold, and the knotty problem of whether to organize the new domain wrung from Mexico as free or slave, threatened for a time to endanger the Union. It was only the series of compromises submitted to Congress by the aged Senator Henry Clay of Kentucky and which finally passed into law in September, 1850, that postponed for another decade the final adjudication of this tantalizing question by a resort to arms. Far-sighted men realized that the settlement of 1850 was only a compromise; nonetheless, they were grateful to Clay and to those who supported him for having offered a plan that had at least gained them more time. But the political compromises did not come promptly enough to preserve the unity of some of the principal Protestant churches, for as early as May, 1845, the southern Baptists and Methodists had broken with their northern brethren over the slavery issue and schism was to follow among the Presbyterians on the same question in 1857.[21] Yet differ as they did over the burning question, the Catholic bishops of the North and the South did not allow it to divide their counsels, and when they convened at Baltimore in the spring of 1852 Archbishop Blanc of New Orleans and his suffragans from the deep South sat side by side with their northern episcopal colleagues during the debates on the measures that were to be taken to advance the spiritual welfare of their respective flocks.

The decade immediately preceding the holding of the plenary council had been one filled with unpleasantness for these bishops and their people by reason of the Nativists' campaigns of hate against Catholics and foreigners. True, the worst fury of the Nativists had been spent by 1852, but there were still painful reminders in all sections of the land of their ugly handiwork. Nor had the movement completely died out; it was only temporarily dormant. In the month before the council opened a secret society, calling itself the Order of the Star Spangled Banner and first organized in 1849, passed into the hands of more energetic management when James W. Barker took control. Under Barker who assumed charge in April, 1852, the order expanded rapidly and, as the historian of this movement stated, "within four months more than a thousand members were enrolled and its influence was felt in the municipal elections of 1852."[22] Secret though this rising Know-Nothing group then was, the Catholic bishops were quite aware of the opposition which previous councils of the American Church had aroused and they knew the same forces were still watchful of their every move. This fact was probably in the minds of a number of the prelates as they set out for Baltimore in May of that year.

---

[21] William Warren Sweet, *The Story of Religion in America* (New York, 1939), pp. 430-40.

The year of the plenary council was a presidential election year, and the publication on March 20 of Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* helped to heighten the political tension that filled the air until after the close of the campaign in November. As a recent authority on the period has said:

> It was obvious as 1852 opened that personalities and party loyalty, not questions of public policy, would decide the coming contest. The country was enjoying a prosperous lull after the storm, and any mandate it gave would be for a continuance of the truce. Business interests had decreed that the recent compromise must stand, and with business was aligned the great mass of farmers, workmen, and professional folk.[23]

It was only ten days after the bishops had closed their meeting in Baltimore that the Democrats gathered in the same city and nominated Franklin Pierce, a small town lawyer from New Hampshire to be their candidate, after leaders like Lewis Cass, James Buchanan, and Stephen A. Douglas had failed to win the necessary votes. Two weeks later the Whigs followed their rivals into Baltimore and in this convention, too, the outstanding leaders killed one another off and General Winfield Scott of Virginia emerged the victor for the nomination of his party.

The city to which the American Catholic bishops came in the spring of 1852, to be followed so soon by the nominating conventions of the two leading political parties, offered in itself an example of the era of expansion through which the nation was passing. Baltimore then had a population of 170,000 people and it was growing steadily. Not only was it the metropolis of the State of Maryland and the largest city and seaport between Philadelphia and New Orleans, but for over sixty years now it had been the center of American Catholic activities with most of the leading events of the Church held in this premier see. In the three and a half decades since John Carroll's death the Church of the United States had shown a growth parallel to that of the nation, and in the year of the mid-century the Catholic population of the country was estimated to be 1,606,000.[24] The Catholic people were scattered over the entire United States and their religious life was then organized in six archdioceses, twenty-five dioceses, and three vicariates apostolic. Within the confines of these thirty-four ecclesiastical jurisdictions there were 1,411 churches and 681 so-called stations in which the Catholic people worshipped, with their spiritual needs cared for by a total of 1,421 priests of whom 1,242 were engaged in parochial work and the remaining 179 in teaching and other duties.[25]

---

[22] Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860* (New York, 1938), p. 381.

[23] Allan Nevins, *Ordeal of the Union* (New York, 1947), II, 3. Nevins' is the most recent detailed account of these years.

If the Catholic increase since the meeting of Carroll's hierarchy in 1810 drew the surprised comment of the writer in the *Catholic Mirror* in the week before the opening of the First Plenary Council, how much more surprised would he be by the comparative figures of a century ago and those of the present time! The current *Catholic Directory* lists the Catholic people in the United States as numbering 27,766,141 who are now governed by twenty-four archbishops, of whom three are cardinals, 102 bishops, one vicar apostolic, and one abbot nullius. Counting the two sees that are at present vacant one gets a total of 130 ecclesiastical jurisdictions against the thirty-four of a hundred years ago. Moreover, besides the 128 ordinaries there are likewise today one coadjutor archbishop, seven coadjutor bishops, and forty-six auxiliary bishops to make a hierarchy of 182 prelates in contrast to the thirty-three bishops who ruled the Church of the United

---

[24] Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., *Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith?* (New York, 1925), p. 134.

[25] *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory . . . 1852* (Baltimore, 1852), p. 257. There was one vacant see at the time of the council, Walla Walla, which was being administered by Bishop A. M. A. Blanchet and which was suppressed by Rome in July, 1853.

States in 1852. The 1,421 priests of a century ago have now increased to 43,889 and the 2,092 churches and stations of 1852 have multiplied during the century to a total of 28,488 churches, chapels, missions, and stations wherein religious services are held.

But to return to the council at Baltimore. There were some interesting personalities among the prelates and priests who participated in the sessions of May, 1852. Mention has already been made of Archbishop Kenrick, the apostolic delegate, who was easily the outstanding theologian of the American Church at the time, and of John Hughes, the colorful Archbishop of New York, who had already won national fame for his great fight over the question of religion in the public schools, but who yet had before him what was probably the most famous episode of his life, namely, his mission to Europe in November, 1861, for President Lincoln and the Union government. Seated with them in the places reserved for the metropolitans were Blanchet of Oregon City, Kenrick of St. Louis, Blanc of New Orleans, and Purcell of Cincinnati. Of the twenty-four American bishops who took counsel in those days with their metropolitans one third were members of religious orders or congregations. They numbered one Redemptorist (Neumann of Philadelphia), one Sulpician (Chanche of Natchez), two Vincentians (John M. Odin of Galveston and Timon of Buffalo), two Dominicans (Richard P. Miles of Nashville and Joseph S. Alemany of Monterey), and two Jesuits (James Van de Velde of Chicago and John B. Miège of Indian Territory). The oldest bishop in the council by date of appointment was Portier of Mobile who had been consecrated on Nov. 5, 1826. From far off New Mexico came its vicar apostolic, John Baptist Lamy, who with Kenrick of St. Louis and Alemany of California were the only ones to attend all three plenary councils of the American Church as bishops. Among the prelates at Baltimore in 1852 the two who were destined to play the most prominent roles in the years ahead, apart from several already mentioned, were Spalding of Louisville who as Archbishop of Baltimore (1864-1872) would convoke the Second Plenary Council in 1866, and McCloskey of Albany who in 1864 succeeded Hughes as second Archbishop of New York and eleven years later became the first cardinal of the United States. Eight countries figured among the birthplaces of the thirty-three American ordinaries of 1852 and these were ranked in the following order: the

United States and France nine each, Ireland eight, Belgium and Canada two each, and Austria, Spain, and Switzerland one each. Only a fraction over one-fourth of the prelates, therefore, were native-born Americans in this year, and the leading role which France had played in American Catholicism in the early nineteenth century was still evident with the French-born bishops ranking equal in number to those of the United States. The national origins of the American hierarchy would change considerably in the ensuing decades and France would ultimately fall behind Germany as the birthplace of bishops who ruled American sees.

Of the twelve superiors of religious orders the man who attained the greatest fame before his death in 1887 was undoubtedly Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B., who three years after the council was named the first Benedictine abbot in the United States and who exercised a wide and beneficent influence on American Catholicism from the flourishing St. Vincent's Abbey at Latrobe, Pennsylvania, which he founded and over which he ruled for so many years. Among the priests who were designated as theologians and officials of the council there were nine future bishops: Augustine Vérot, S.S. (Savannah and St. Augustine), Anthony O'Regan (Chicago), Napoleon J. Perché (New Orleans), John Loughlin (Brooklyn), James Roosevelt Bayley (Newark and Baltimore), Josue M. Young (Erie), Thomas Foley (Chicago), Patrick N. Lynch (Charleston), and John J. Conroy (Albany).

Likewise numbered among the priests who were in Baltimore in the spring of 1852 were several who were to acquire outstanding reputations within their own dioceses and beyond. For example, two of the theologians to the apostolic delegate were Henry B. Coskery, who for so many years was the Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, and Charles I. White, the first editor of the *Catholic Mirror* and the author of several books, among them the *Life of Mrs. Eliza A. Seton, Foundress and First Superior of the Sisters of Charity in the United States* which was announced in the *Catholic Mirror* of May 15, 1852, as having recently been put to press by Edward Dunigan & Brother of New York. There was also James Fitton of Boston who served as theologian to Bishop Chanche and who had already made a name for himself in his native New England, a man whose life proved to be one of the most fruitful missionary careers in the American Church before its close in 1881.[26] Another priest who had shown a missionary zeal in the Middle West almost equal to that of Fitton in New England was Peter Kindekens, Vicar General of the Diocese of Detroit, who served his ordinary, Peter P. Lefevere, as theologian in the council. Father Kindekens was the man who four years later was chosen to act as the agent of Bishops Spalding and Lefevere in founding an institution to train priests for the American missions at the Catholic University of Louvain, and it was Kindekens who in March, 1857, became the first Rector of the American College at Louvain, an office he held until December, 1859.[27] Ignatius Reynolds, the Bishop of Charleston, had as his theologians John Murray Forbes and Sylvester Malone, two well-known priests of the Archdiocese of New York. The former was a convert from the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1849 who, unfortunately, apostacized from the faith a decade later, and the latter was a friend of liberal causes and a defender of Dr. Edward McGlynn in the single tax controversy of the 1880's.[28] Also numbered among the theologians were the prominent Jesuit army chaplain of the Mexican War, John McElroy, who acted as theologian to Bishop Bernard O'Reilly of Hartford, and John McCaffrey, who for thirty-four years was President of Mount Saint Mary's College in Emmitsburg and who served as theologian for Bishop Francis X. Gartland of Savannah.[29]

During the course of their deliberations the bishops held four solemn sessions in the cathedral and seven public and eleven private congregations in either the cathedral or the archbishop's residence. The agenda of the various meetings traversed a wide range of subjects. At the outset much time was devoted to a discussion of the need for new dioceses and of their delimitation.

---

[26] For Fitton cf. Robert H. Lord, John E. Sexton, and Edward T. Harrington, *History of the Archdiocese of Boston* (New York, 1944), II, *passim*.

[27] On Kindekens cf. George Paré, *The Catholic Church in Detroit, 1701-1888* (Detroit, 1951), pp. 450 ff., and J. Van der Heyden, *The Louvain American College, 1857-1907* (Louvain, 1909), pp. 12-67.

[28] For Forbes cf. John Cardinal Farley, *The Life of John Cardinal McCloskey* (New York, 1918), pp. 195-97, and on Malone, Sylvester L. Malone, (Ed.), *Memorial of the Golden Jubilee of the Rev. Sylvester Malone* (Brooklyn, 1895).

[29] On McElroy cf. the biographical sketch by Richard J. Purcell in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, XII, 36-37, and for McCaffrey, Mary M. Meline and Edward F. X. McSweeny, *The Story of the Mountain* (Emmitsburg, 1911), I, 378 ff; II, 1-90.

Matters such as the demand for Catholic elementary schools held the bishops' attention on May 11 and they agreed on a decree that might be thought to have put the question beyond debate for the future. On the following days the prelates discussed the problems pertaining to the legal incorporation of church properties and the best way of handling rebellious lay trustees, the attitude they should take toward secret societies, the responsibility they should assume toward Catholic children in public schools, and freedom of worship for Catholics in the armed services. In the fourth and fifth public congregations on May 13-14 the theologians debated before the bishops the expediency of extending canonical status to pastors in the United States. Other subjects that engaged the attention of the Fathers were what dispensations from the lenten fast should be sought from the Holy See by bishops of the western dioceses, what steps should be taken to bring about a uniform catechism, the form of a petition to Rome for more ample faculties in marriage cases, and the curriculum of studies in the seminaries. Early in the council five committees were appointed for the investigation of specific topics and other committees evolved as the debates progressed as, for example, when the apostolic delegate on May 14 named Bishops Reynolds, Timon, and Spalding to constitute a committee for drawing up recommendations on a uniform catechism. In the closing days of the council these committees reported back to their colleagues and in some cases their recommendations were accepted, in others they were voted down. A case in point occurred when the fathers declined to give approval to a new edition of the Roman Ritual which the committee on that subject suggested on May 18.[30]

At the outset of the council the apostolic delegate assigned the writing of the customary conciliar letters. Bishop O'Connor was chosen to compose the Latin letter of the hierarchy to Pius IX, Portier was assigned the French letter to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Neumann was asked to write a similar letter in German to the Leopoldinen-Stiftung of Vienna and to the other German societies that had aided the American missions, Archbishop Purcell was to compose a letter in the name of all to

---

[30] The meager record of the council's various sessions is contained in *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 7-43.

Archbishop Cullen and the Irish hierarchy, and finally the pastoral letter to the priests and people of the United States was to be the work of Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis. During the last three private congregations on May 19-20 the drafts of these letters were read by their authors and received the consent of the bishops that they should be sent in their names.[31]

During the course of the council a sermon was preached in the cathedral every evening with the preachers numbering Archbishops Purcell, Peter Kenrick, and Hughes, Bishops McCloskey and McGill, and Fathers Lynch of Charleston and two Jesuits, William S. Murphy and Charles H. Stonestreet, the latter the President of Georgetown College. On May 13 the pontifical requiem for the prelates deceased since the last council was sung by Bishop Chanche and Spalding preached the eulogy which was centered around Samuel Eccleston, S.S., Archbishop of Baltimore, Flaget of Louisville, and William Tyler, Bishop of Hartford, who had died since 1849. The third solemn session on May 16 had Archbishop Blanchet as the celebrant of the Mass with the Bishop of Pittsburgh as the preacher, and at the final solemn session four days later, the feast of the Ascension, Archbishop Blanc pontificated and Bishop Fitzpatrick preached the sermon. After the Mass and sermon had been concluded on May 20 the secretaries read the twenty-five decrees that had been passed by the prelates during the twelve days they had been in session and each bishop thereupon gave his public assent to the legislation. The Archbishop of New York then voiced the thanks of the participating bishops to the apostolic delegate for the tact and wisdom with which he had presided and for the hospitality he had afforded to them during their stay in his see city. Following Hughes' brief remarks Kenrick rose to reply but he said very little since he was so deeply moved by the occasion that, as the minutes quaintly put it, "lacrymis sermonem abrumpere coactus est."[32]

At first sight it might seem strange that the final product of nearly two weeks of discussion on the part of the hierarchy should have resulted in only twenty-five decrees. But it should be remembered that a great deal of the prelates' time was consumed in hearing the arguments for and against various measures and in private consultations on the advisability of particular legislative proposals. The participants had been entirely free throughout the days of debate to register their disapproval of suggested laws, and that they availed themselves of their right there was no doubt. A case in point concerned the best means of providing for parochial schools. On May 11 the bishops had listened as the theologians debated at length the advisability of legislating on the necessity of such schools, and in the end the prelates passed a decree (XIII) that strongly urged that parochial schools be attached to every church in the American dioceses. But a week later when it was suggested that societies be instituted for the financial maintenance of parochial schools the views of the fifteen bishops who voted for such societies were overruled by the sixteen votes cast against the proposal.[33] In this way a number of measures fell by the wayside and thus the debates were at times prolonged over subjects which failed to find their way into the final decrees of the council. But the freedom of debate and the leisurely pace with which the council moved more than made up for any defect in the number of laws enacted and helped to assure solid legislation in the end.

---

[31] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12, 37-39.

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

Insofar as the decrees themselves were concerned, the historian of the Baltimore councils pronounced the legislation of 1852 "the most important step so far made by the hierarchy for complete uniformity of Church life in the United States."[34] What, in brief, were the enactments of the bishops of 1852 that became law for the American Church after they had received the approval of the Holy See? The first decree affirmed their loyal adherence to the Sovereign Pontiff as the successor of St. Peter and to the complete enactments of the ecumenical councils which the popes had promulgated for the Universal Church. This was followed by a proclamation that all the laws of the seven provincial councils that had been held in Baltimore between 1829 and 1849 were binding on the entire Church of the nation. The next decrees commanded that the Roman Ritual and the *Manual of Ceremonies*, previously ordered by the council of 1829 and approved by Pope Gregory XVI, should be used in all churches of the country. The fifth decree legislated that bishops should not be absent from their dioceses for more than three months without permission of the Holy See, the metropolitan, or the senior suffragan of the province.[35]

---

[33] *Ibid.*, pp. 27, 37.

[34] Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

Decrees VI and VII dealt with the organization of diocesan administration and revealed how imperfect such administration had been up to that time. In the former the ordinaries were exhorted to appoint consultors who would meet at least once a month, while in the latter decree the establishment of a chancery office in every diocese was strongly urged. The next decree counseled the bishops to name one or more censors of books for the examination of prayer books and other publications pertaining to religion, and the practice of seeking the *imprimatur* from any other bishop than the one in whose diocese a book was published was discouraged. Mention was made in the following decree of the danger to souls involved in admitting to the active ministry unknown priests from Europe without first receiving credentials from their bishops and obtaining the consent of the ordinaries to whose dioceses they desired to transfer. It was further decreed that ecclesiastical districts (there were no parishes in the canonical sense at the time) were to be given clearly defined limits by the bishops as soon as possible and the jurisdiction and privileges of the priests within those districts were likewise to be laid down. Banns of marriage were to be proclaimed in all American churches after Easter of 1853, from which there was to be no dispensation except in cases of the gravest necessity. It was also decreed that priests were to institute catechetical instruction classes in their parishes and they were not to delegate this duty to others. Decree XIII, as has been mentioned, exhorted the bishops "per viscera misericordiae Dei" to provide a parochial school for every church in their dioceses, and declared that parish funds might be used to engage competent teachers for these schools. In the fourteenth decree the bishops who did not have a diocesan seminary were advised to consult with their fellow suffragans of the same province so that there might be established at least one seminary in every province.[36]

---

[35] *Concilium plenarium* . . ., pp. 43-45. Reference is made here to the official edition of the decrees as finally approved by the Holy See.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 45-47.

The fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth decrees had to do with the administration of ecclesiastical properties and the safeguards that should be taken to avoid abuses from lay trustees, a system from which the American Church had suffered so much since the days of Archbishop Carroll. The Fathers likewise prescribed that the ritual was to be strictly observed throughout all their dioceses in giving benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. And at a time when the rights of conscience of Catholic men enrolled in the army and navy were not infrequently violated, it was not surprising to find the bishops in 1852 including a decree which urged that infractions of this kind be reported to the civil authorities in a tactful manner in order to win for the service men their full rights. Another decree exhorted the prelates to promote the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in their dioceses, a society which, it was said, had done so much among the French to advance the cause of religion. The Fathers, moreover, recommended that the American Catholic laity be encouraged to join a society devoted to prayers for the conversion of non-Catholics, and it was stated that they would petition the Pope to favor such groups by granting indulgences for this pious work.[37] This was another canon wherein a current trend was reflected, for a considerable number of converts had been received into the Church of late years, and the bishops were doubtless hopeful that an American counterpart to the Oxford Movement—then showing such promise in England—might develop in the United States.[38] Two further decrees related to the sacrament of marriage and the need which the prelates felt for extraordinary faculties from the Holy See in certain marriage cases. After a statement on the necessity of petitioning Rome for use of the short form in administering the sacrament of baptism, the legislation of 1852 closed with Decree XXV which declared that the foregoing laws would be in force for the American Church as soon as they country. The fifth decree legislated that bishops should not be absent from their dioceses for more than three months without permission of the Holy See, the metropolitan, or the senior suffragan of the province.[35]

---

[37] The petition for indulgences was granted in Barnabò to Kenrick, Rome, Sept. 5, 1852, *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 59-60.

[38] There is no adequate history of the American convert movement of the mid and late nineteenth century. For a popular account of some of the American converts to Catholicism in these years cf. Edward J. Mannix, *The American Convert Movement* (New York, 1923), pp. 11-19; 107-110. For an earlier period cf. Sister Laurita Gibson, *Some Anglo-American Converts to Catholicism Prior to 1829* (Washington, 1943).

Decrees VI and VII dealt with the organization of diocesan administration and revealed how imperfect such administration had been up to that time. In the former the ordinaries were exhorted to appoint consultors who would meet at least once a month, while in the latter decree the establishment of a chancery office in every diocese was strongly urged. The next decree counseled the bishops to name one or more censors of books for the examination of prayer books and other publications pertaining to religion, and the practice of seeking the *imprimatur* from any other bishop than the one in whose diocese a book was published was discouraged. Mention was made in the following decree of the danger to souls involved in admitting to the active ministry unknown priests from Europe without first receiving credentials from their bishops and obtaining the consent of the ordinaries to whose dioceses they desired to transfer. It was further decreed that ecclesiastical districts (there were no parishes in the canonical sense at the time) were to be given clearly defined limits by the bishops as soon as possible and the jurisdiction and privileges of the priests within those districts were likewise to be laid down. Banns of marriage were to be proclaimed in all American churches after Easter of 1853, from which there was to be no dispensation except in cases of the gravest necessity. It was also decreed that priests were to institute catechetical instruction classes in their parishes and they were not to delegate this duty to others. Decree XIII, as has been mentioned, exhorted the bishops "per viscera misericordiae Dei" to provide a parochial school for every church in their dioceses, and declared that parish funds might be used to engage competent teachers for these schools. In the fourteenth decree the bishops who did not have a diocesan seminary were advised to consult with their fellow suffragans of the same province so that there might be established at least one seminary in every province.[36]

---

[35] *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 43-45. Reference is made here to the official edition of the decrees as finally approved by the Holy See.

[36] *Ibid.*, pp. 45-47.

The fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth decrees had to do with the administration of ecclesiastical properties and the safeguards that should be taken to avoid abuses from lay trustees, a system from which the American Church had suffered so much since the days of Archbishop Carroll. The Fathers likewise prescribed that the ritual was to be strictly observed throughout all their dioceses in giving benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. And at a time when the rights of conscience of Catholic men enrolled in the army and navy were not infrequently violated, it was not surprising to find the bishops in 1852 including a decree which urged that infractions of this kind be reported to the civil authorities in a tactful manner in order to win for the service men their full rights. Another decree exhorted the prelates to promote the establishment of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith in their dioceses, a society which, it was said, had done so much among the French to advance the cause of religion. The Fathers, moreover, recommended that the American Catholic laity be encouraged to join a society devoted to prayers for the conversion of non-Catholics, and it was stated that they would petition the Pope to favor such groups by granting indulgences for this pious work.[37] This was another canon wherein a current trend was reflected, for a considerable number of converts had been received into the Church of late years, and the bishops were doubtless hopeful that an American counterpart to the Oxford Movement—then showing such promise in England—might develop in the United States.[38] Two further decrees related to the sacrament of marriage and the need which the prelates felt for extraordinary faculties from the Holy See in certain marriage cases. After a statement on the necessity of petitioning Rome for use of the short form in administering the sacrament of baptism, the legislation of 1852 closed with Decree XXV which declared that the foregoing laws would be in force for the American Church as soon as they had received the approval of the Holy See and had been published by the authority of the Archbishop of Baltimore.[39]

---

[37] The petition for indulgences was granted in Barnabò to Kenrick, Rome, Sept. 5, 1852, *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 59-60.

[38] There is no adequate history of the American convert movement of the mid and late nineteenth century. For a popular account of some of the American converts to Catholicism in these years cf. Edward J. Mannix, *The American Convert Movement* (New York, 1923), pp. 11-19; 107-110. For an earlier period cf. Sister Laurita Gibson, *Some Anglo-American Converts to Catholicism Prior to 1829* (Washington, 1943).

At the close of every Baltimore council of the American bishops from 1829 to 1884 the prelates issued a pastoral letter to their priests and people, and to this rule the council of 1852 was no exception. The document was written by Archbishop Peter R. Kenrick and in a day when anti-Catholic bigotry again stalked the land and when the ghost of lay trusteeism had not yet been entirely laid, it was natural to find the Archbishop of St. Louis devoting the first section of the pastoral to an analysis of the Catholic doctrine on episcopal authority and an explanation of the source from which it had taken its rise. From this topic there was an easy transition to an outline of the proper method of administering the properties of the Church and a summary of the discipline which the Church was divinely commissioned to enforce on its faithful.

Kenrick next passed to the needs that then confronted the Church of the United States, and while he was careful to pay tribute to the past generosity of the American Catholic people, he did not fail to appeal for their continued support so that more churches, seminaries, and schools might be built to serve the rapidly expanding population. The faithful were reminded of Pius IX's letter of Nov. 21, 1851, which had called on the bishops of the entire Catholic world to provide for the religious education of youth. In this regard the archbishop remarked that the American bishops were following the example of the Irish hierarchy who had been so courageously opposing the introduction of a system of education in Ireland based on a principle which the prelates of both countries condemned, and who were at the moment attempting to unite religious with secular learning of the highest order by the establishment at Dublin of the Catholic University of Ireland. The Irish Catholic university, said Kenrick, was "an undertaking in the success of which we necessarily feel a deep interest, and which, as having been suggested by the Soveriegn Pontiff, powerfully appeals to the sympathies of the whole Catholic world."[40] The pastoral letter had words of high commendation for the Society for the Propagation of the Faith and it contained special paragraphs for the priests, the sisters, and the laity. In an oblique manner Kenrick referred to the agitation of the Nativist enemies of Catholicism in the United States who had been so busy of recent years spreading calumnies against the Church. But his only suggestion to the faithful in the face of these attacks was the practice of restraint and a strict obedience to the laws of the Republic. On this subject he said:

---

[39] *Concilium plenarium* . . ., pp. 47-50.

[40] Peter Guilday (Ed.), *The National Pastorals of the American Hierarchy* (*1792-1919*) (Washington, 1923), p. 191.

> Show your attachment to the institutions of our beloved country by prompt compliance with all their requirements, and by the cautious jealousy with which you guard against the least deviation from the rules which they prescribe for the maintenance of public order and private rights. Thus will you refute the idle babbling of foolish men, and will best approve yourselves worthy of the privileges which you enjoy, and overcome, by the sure test of practical patriotism, all the prejudices which a misapprehension of your principles but too often produces.[41]

On May 20 the bishops began to take their departure for home and there to await the formal approval of their legislation from the Holy See. Ten days after the council closed Archbishop Hughes told his friend, Father Terence J. Donaghoe, "Our great National Council is over, and has been among the most agreeable I ever attended. The President was kind and impartial and at the close he gave evidence of more heart and feeling than I thought he possessed. He fairly shed tears."[42] Hughes' previous relations with Kenrick apparently had not led him to believe that the latter was capable of such a show of emotion. The conciliar decrees were entrusted to the care of Bishop Van de Velde of Chicago who left Baltimore on May 25 for Rome.[43] All through the late spring and summer the bishops were in correspondence on affairs of the council with Kenrick, and from time to time they revealed their uneasiness over the failure of their legislation to win a prompt approval in Rome. Bishop Timon for one had already experienced a severe trial with the rebellious trustees of St. Louis Church in Buffalo. At that time the Taber Bill was before the New York legislature and Archbishop Hughes was hopeful that this bill might make it possible for the bishops of the State of New York to hold church properties as corporations sole.[44] But the prospects of the measure being enacted into law were very slim and Timon was, therefore, all the more anxious that some assistance might result from the council's decrees on the holding of church property. In communicating some of his worries on this score to Kenrick, the Bishop of Buffalo alluded to a pet project of his friend in Baltimore which was of more than local interest. He said:

---

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 192. Kenrick may have been tempered by remembrance of the fact that the pastoral letters of the hierarchy following the provincial councils of 1829, 1837, and 1843 had all taken pains to refute in some detail the lies of the Nativists, but with little or no result other than to stir the latter to more vigorous outbursts against the Church. For the bishops' statements on the subject in the councils mentioned cf. Guilday, *National Pastorals . . .*, pp. 27-28; 80-95; 153-54.

[42] Hughes to Donaghoe, New York, May 30, 1852, in *In the Early Days. Pages from the Annals of the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary*, 3rd ed. (Dubuque, 1943), p. 149.

[43] ADN, the rough draft of a letter in French from Bishop Chanche to Raffaele Fornari of Propaganda, Baltimore, May 26, 1852, copy.

> I would not now trouble you, it is not necessary, were it not that I feel myself pressed to express how much I rejoice that you again entertain the idea of a Bishopric at Washington. It seems to be certain that such a step will produce the greater glory of God and the salvation of souls; it will add a jewel to your crown; one only objection seemed to me to have weight, the danger of political intrigue; but if a man of ordinary good sense be there, should he even try such a thing, he would be so scorched in the first attempt, as to verify for his after conduct, the old proverb, a burnt child etc. May God guide you in this, as He has done in so many things for his glory.[45]

In the days before the establishment of the American College at Rome in 1859 the bishops of the United States frequently employed the officials of one or other of the national English-speaking colleges in the Eternal City as their agents at the Holy See. It was to Tobias Kirby, Rector of the Irish College from the departure of Archbishop Cullen for Armagh in 1850 to the former's death in 1895, that Kenrick now turned to help the American legislation through the Congregation of the Propaganada. Kirby was in fairly steady correspondence with Baltimore during the summer of 1852 and in a letter of late August he informed the archbishop that Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburgh had just arrived and that the latter could now assist the cause they all had at heart by giving verbal explanations of some of the decrees to the Propaganda officials. The Rector of the Irish College pronounced the pastoral letter of the Baltimore council "magnificent," and he added that everyone in Rome was likewise impressed by the conciliar letter to the Archbishop of Armagh on the Catholic University of Ireland. Cullen had sent a copy of the letter document on to Rome and it had received high commendation, not only from the men at Propaganda but, as Kirby expressed it, "even the *zucchetto bianco* itself was most gratified." He hoped, therefore, that the message from the Americans would help to bring some of the opposing Irish bishops around to support the university.

---

[44] Robert F. McNamara, "Trusteeism in the Atlantic States, 1785-1863," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXX (July, 1944), 149-50.

[45] AAB, 31-Q-8, Timon to Kenrick, Buffalo, July 16, 1852. Kenrick had not been in Baltimore three months when he told his brother, "I am thinking of having the city of Washington erected into an episcopal see." (Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Dec. 24, 1851, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, p. 321.) Almost a century was to pass before this idea was translated into action with the erection of the Archdiocese of Washington on July 22, 1939.

Meanwhile Kirby was doing what he could to hasten the approbation of the conciliar legislation. In a postscript added to his letter a week later he said he had hoped that he might tell Kenrick that confirmation of the decrees had been given; but Cardinal Fransoni, Prefect of Propaganda, had informed him that day that they had not been able to finish their work. Several of the cardinals had remarked that they thought the task of the secretaries of the council had been "rather clumsily executed," and this Kirby felt Kenrick should know.[46]

All through September Bishop O'Connor maintained his vigil at Propaganda. Early in the month he informed Kenrick that he had been unsuccessful in trying to find out what was causing the delay in the approval of the decrees. One thing he had learned, and that was the opposition that had developed to Father Edward Purcell of Cincinnati whose name had been submitted to the council by his brother, the archbishop, as a candidate for one of the projected new sees.[47] Three weeks later O'Connor explained to his metropolitan that he was still answering Propaganda's questions and handing in memoranda there for the officials, but he said he realized that his memoranda lacked any official authority. One matter that he had been told was holding up the confirmation of the decrees was the question of the financial support that was owing to the bishops from their priests and people.[48] But the end was nearer than the Bishop of Pittsburgh had supposed, and two days after his letter Cardinal Fransoni signed the document on Sept. 26, 1852, which gave the official approbation of the Holy See to the conciliar decrees of the previous May.[49]

---

[46] *Ibid.*, 30-I-7, Kirby to Kenrick, Rome, Aug. 22, 23, and 31, 1852 (one letter). Earlier in the month Kenrick had told the Bishop of Richmond, "The Cardinal Prefect has acknowledged the receipt of the decrees, and Bp. Van de Velde reports a very gracious reception from His Holiness. He thinks that it will take a long time to obtain the confirmation" (Archives of the Diocese of Richmond, Kenrick to McGill, Baltimore, Aug. 2, 1852, microfilm).

Yet the news of Propaganda's action took a long time in reaching the United States. In mid-November Kenrick was still in a somewhat fretful state of mind when he told Hughes that O'Connor had reported the Roman officials as disposed to restrict very much the American bishops' dispensing powers and to require recourse to the Holy See in individual cases. "They refuse to retrench feasts, or fasts," he said, "deeming uniformity not desirable, as it tends to give a national character to the Church of United States in matters discordant from general discipline." The Romans, he continued, were urging the observance of the feast of the Circumcision in all American dioceses and that of the Immaculate Conception as a national festival. On another matter in which Kenrick had more than a passing interest he remarked to Hughes, "They refuse recognising the primacy of Baltimore, but offer to give it some token of favor as mater ecclesiarum, 'honorificum aliquod privilegium' quod a caeteris illam distinguat."[50] On the same day that he wrote to the Archbishop of New York he was somewhat more explicit to his brother. He stated:

---

[47] *Ibid.*, 30-W-11, O'Connor to Kenrick, Rome, September 3, 1852. The opposition to Purcell's nomination for the episcopal office was expressed by Bishop Reynolds for one, although O'Connor of Pittsburgh was in favor of the brother of the Archbishop of Cincinnati. (Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Aug. 10 and Oct. 20, 1852, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 334-35.)

[48] *Ibid.*, 30-W-12, O'Connor to Kenrick, Sept. 24, 1852.

[49] *Concilium plenarium* . . ., pp. 56-57.

[50] AANY, Kenrick to Hughes, Baltimore, Nov. 18, 1852. The unanimous request of the bishops of the Seventh Provincial Council in May, 1849, that

> At last the Bishop of Pittsburgh has arrived here bringing the documents which refer to the decrees of the Council. Many of these have been recast. The Holy See refuses to recognize the Archbishop of Baltimore as Primate, also refuses to abrogate certain days of fast which are observed in some dioceses. . . . The Catechisms it sends back with corrections suggested by certain theologians, but withholds approbation.[51]

Other prelates besides Kenrick were puzzled about how they should proceed in enforcing some of the recent legislation without Rome's confirmation. Archbishop Purcell was probably reflecting the divided opinions of the bishops on several subjects in council and the narrow margins by which they had been voted into decrees when he told Kenrick:

> From the kind of approbation given to some of the Acts, I fear, we shall be at a loss, without a special instruction from yourself, to determine what are of binding force & what *ad libitum*. For instance, must we observe the 8th of December as a Holiday of obligation? . . . And must we cease to use—suppress—our present diocesan catechism with which we may have no fault to find?[52]

These were questions which the formal approval and accompanying instructions from Propaganda would in good measure answer when they arrived in the United States. But even after the Roman confirmation was received in mid-November it was seen that time would be needed to bring the legislation into full force and to settle the doubtful points about some of the new regulations.

Although the subject of new ecclesiastical jurisdictions for the rapidly growing Church of the United States had been one of the first topics discussed in the preliminary meeting of the prelates at Baltimore on May 8, it was the last to receive a final settlement

---

Baltimore be raised to the dignity of a primatial see was deferred by Rome at that time without any reasons being given. (Guilday, *Councils*, p. 157.) However, in a decree of Propaganda signed by the prefect, Alessandro Cardinal Barnabò, on Aug. 15, 1858, the Archbishop of Baltimore was granted "prerogative of place" in all gatherings of the American hierarchy. It meant that he would take precedence over all archbishops in the United States, regardless of seniority in date of consecration or ordination. The only exception to this rule was when an American archbishop was a cardinal and in this case, of course, he would outrank the Archbishop of Baltimore.

[51] Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Nov. 18, 1852, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 339-40.

[52] AAB, 31-B-6, Purcell to Kenrick, Cincinnati, Nov. 23, 1852.

in Rome. Over six months after the official confirmation of the decrees the Holy See had not yet acted in erecting the new dioceses which the bishops had recommended.[53] Kenrick was plainly not happy with the way Van de Velde of Chicago had carried out his mission as the bearer of the decrees to Rome. Early in the new year he told his brother:

> The man from Chicago has unsettled everything, stating that the Archbishops arranged things just as they chose: that they determined upon the erection of this new diocese [Quincy] without consulting him, and recommended priests [to head the new see] without his knowledge.[54]

Meanwhile Dr. Kirby was trying to push matters, but as he told Kenrick in early May the principal cause of delay had arisen in the United States, not in the Roman Curia. On the day of his letter he had conferred with Monsignor Filippo Vespasiani, one of the *minutanti* of Propaganda, on whom, said Kirby, "a great deal depends as far as the preparation of the Ponenza is concerned." Vespasiani had explained that they were receiving "a multitude of letters" from all parts of the United States and, although it was not likely that these communications would cause any substantial variation in the bishops' desires, Propaganda felt that the points of view which they expressed must be examined and considered, and this, of course, took time.[55] A letter of July 21 from Fransoni to Kenrick on other business threw no light on the question of the delayed new sees, and in referring to the long wait and to this letter of the Prefect of Propaganda Kenrick remarked a month later to Hughes, "Not the slightest reference is made to our Council, or the nominations."[56]

But things were not as bad as they seemed, and on July 29, 1853, the Congregation of the Propaganda acted in pursuance of most of the recommendations of the First Plenary Council in a series of decrees that brought about the greatest territorial changes in the American Church up to that time. On that date nine new dioceses were created, namely, Brooklyn, Burlington, Covington, Erie, Natchitoches (Alexandria), Newark, Portland in Maine, Quincy (Springfield in Illinois), and Santa Fe. Moreover, a new metropolitan see was established on the Pacific Coast with the Archdiocese of San Francisco, the Vicariate Apostolic of Upper Michigan (Marquette) came into existence, and the Diocese of Walla Walla was suppressed and its territory divided between the Archdiocese of Oregon City and the Diocese of Nesqually.[57] The delay of a year and two months had proved a bit irksome to some of the American bishops but the action when it came was on the whole in accordance with their wishes. Kirby believed, as he told Kenrick, that all the new bishops appointed were in every case "juxta votum Rmi. Praesulis." The news contained in the letter of the Rector of the Irish College in all likelihood made up to the Archbishop of Baltimore for much of the anxiety he had experienced over the final outcome. Kirby had appreciated his uneasiness over the delay and he told him:

---

[53] In early April Kenrick reported a letter of March 6 from Bishop Spalding in Florence who said that Propaganda would not finish with the affairs of the council until after Easter (Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, April 5, 1853, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, p. 354).

[54] Kenrick to Kenrick, Baltimore, Jan. 18, 1853, in Tourscher, *op. cit.*, pp. 347-48.

[55] AAB, 30-I-8, Kirby to Kenrick, Rome, Feast of St. John of the Latin Gate [May 6], 1853.

[56] AANY, Kenrick to Hughes, Baltimore, Aug. 21, 1853.

> At the winding up of all the S. Cgn. more clearly understood the wisdom of the decisions made by the council. So that as one of the Minutanti told me, the delay was useful in that respect, and turned out to be honorific to the council as the examination of every objection proved more validly the reasonableness & justice of the grounds on which it acted. Ringraziamo Iddio. I am happy to mention that the C. Prefect, Mgr. Barnabò and indeed all Propaganda, fully understood the debt which religion owes to Y.G. for the vast services rendered toward the good cause on the present occasion.[58]

Fourteen and a half years were to pass before the American bishops would again assemble at Baltimore in October, 1866, for a national council. In the meantime the nation endured the long and cruel ordeal of the Civil War which put a number of the thirty-two American prelates who had shared each other's counsel so closely in 1852 completely out of touch with their brethren, and created for them vexing problems of which they had previously never even dreamed. Moreover, in the interval between the two meetings fifteen of the bishops of the First Plenary Council passed to their eternal reward and one, Michael O'Connor, resigned his see to enter the Society of Jesus. However, of the forty-four prelates who gathered under the leadership of Archbishop Spalding in the year after the Civil War ended fifteen had been there fourteen years before. The continuity of the conciliar tradition of the American Church was thus, in a sense, living in their persons and these veteran legislators enabled the bishops of 1866 to integrate more skillfully the legislation of May, 1852, with the new canons which were necessary to meet the altered circumstances of the country.[59]

---

[57] For the texts of the documents covering these jurisdictional changes cf. Shearer, *op. cit.*, pp. 274-92. The requests of the council for a diocese at Wilmington, North Carolina, a vicariate apostolic in Florida, and a metropolitan see for Boston were disallowed by Rome as either inexpedient or needing to be deferred for the present. Cf. Fransoni to Kenrick, Rome, Aug. 12, 1853, in *Concilium plenarium . . .*, pp. 63-64.

[58] AAB, 30-I-9, Kirby to Kenrick, Rome, July 29, 1853.

By an interesting coincidence it was less than two months after the close of the American bishops' First Plenary Council that there assembled on July 6, 1852, at St. Mary's College, Oscott, under the presidency of Nicholas Cardinal Wiseman, the First Plenary Council of Westminster. Here the eleven bishops of England and Wales, newly restored as a hierarchy only two years before, gathered in an atmosphere still charged with tension and suspicion over the "papal aggression" which Pius IX had dared to perpetrate against Her Majesty's kingdom in September, 1850. The hierarchies at both Baltimore and Oscott knew from personal experience, therefore, what it meant to live through days of public insult and painful calumny. Yet both groups in this year 1852 went quietly about their spiritual business as bishops of the Church of God. The prelates in Baltimore had not been privileged, as were their brothers at Oscott, to hear so unforgettable a sermon as John Henry Newman preached before the latter on July 13 in "The Second Spring." Nonetheless, as the Americans viewed their accomplishment in retrospect they might fittingly have applied to their own gathering the words which Newman addressed to his friend, Henry Wilberforce, on the day following the close of the council at Oscott when he said, "We ended the Synod yesterday in great triumph, joy, and charity."[60]

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[59] Numbered among the forty-four prelates at the Second Plenary Council were Bishop de Saint-Palais of Vincennes who had been absent in Europe in 1852 and Bishop Modeste Demers of Vancouver who also participated in the sessions of 1866.

[60] Wilfrid Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman* (New York, 1912), I, 295.

THE MORAL PRICE OF INTERSCHOOL ATHLETICS

Within recent months the public has been presented with a series of diverse and shocking revelations about various forms of corruption. Some of these disclosures dealt with dishonesty in political affairs, others concerned business methods. One whole series of these revelations centered around the practice of bribing college athletes to lose interscholastic games, or to manipulate the point margin, for the benefit of the gambling fraternity.

There is solid reason to believe that the revelation of bribery among college athletes is most serious of all, not because of the numbers of people or the sums of money involved, but because this particular scandal is symptomatic of a serious disorder in the very institutions of learning which must be relied upon to influence youth favorably for the common good. Corruption at so important a source of public weal can reach far into the future to spawn its evil effects among generations yet unborn. Disorders that affect the training of youth will naturally produce adverse effects in the future.

Every kind of accusation has been made, all manner of remedy suggested. But in the midst of the great outcry, few voices were raised to condemn the practice of bribing athletes on grounds of morality. Many of the voices so raised introduced moral considerations which centered around the practice of bribery itself and left untouched the larger moral question of athletics in the schools. Until particular cases are assessed against the background of general principles, until the entire question is investigated in the light of these principles, no lasting solution can be found, because only symptoms and not causes will have been treated.

It is proposed here to present a summary review of certain modern athletic practices in the schools and to submit these to a moral evaluation in terms of the nature of the school and the principles of temperance which should regulate man in his recreational activity. From this evaluation, certain conclusions will be drawn regarding the proper place and practice of scholastic athletics.

There are some schools where the athletic program is well regulated and presents no particular problem. These shools keep the value of learning paramount. All extracurricular activities are used to promote the scholastic environment on the campus and a proper attitude toward learning among the students. Schools so favored appear to be in the minority.

In the larger number of schools, a host of problems follows in the wake of large-scale interscholastic athletic competition. Victories bring demands for more difficult competition, bigger and better teams, larger stadiums, more elaborate equipment and the augmentation of the coaching staff. Losses beget pressures for the removal of coaches and for renewed efforts to secure the services of more promising athletes. Especially in schools where this pressure is created by those to whom the school is indebted through political influence or financial affluence, the resulting impact is tremendous.

To answer these varied and insistent demands, many practices have become common which have no immediate relation to the purpose of the school or to the scholastic environment. The services of promising athletes are secured by proselytizing through subsidization that is itself a kind of bribery. Undue proportions of scholarships and of student aid are sometimes accorded to athletes, thus giving them an advantage over non-athletes. In some instances, the entrance requirements are waived in order to get athletes into the schools, and the attendance requirements are relaxed to keep them there. Certain "snap" courses are provided to keep scholastic affairs from interfering with athletic competition, and, in some cases where courses prove too difficult, tutorial service is offered gratis or faculty members are suborned to raise grades in the interest of athletic elegibility.

There are cases of schools which make public policy of subsidizing athletes. Many others, bound by agreement not to do this, connive with their alumni and friends to provide whatever is necessary or useful to secure the attendance of promising players. This latter practice has acquired a certain respectability because many prominent educators are involved in it. But respectability and morality are often poles apart, and one might well question the effect upon a young man or boy when he is confronted with the sight of educators whose integrity he should respect, as they blandly contrive by craft to make mockery of their own pledged word.

Proselytizing athletes has become a business. College representatives travel widely, promise generously and entertain lavishly to persuade high school athletes to attend their institutions. Trips are arranged, gifts are made and lucrative jobs secured to interest promising players. Such methods beget a calculated cynicism among the young who soon learn to pit one representative against the other to secure the greatest gain for themselves. This is a worldly-wise attitude, for cases are not lacking of schools reneging on their promises when the boy has been injured or has failed to measure up to the hopes of the coaching staff. In one instance a school sued a proselytized athlete for recovery of emoluments after he had failed to produce results on a team.

Coaches and athletic directors who work in the midst of these pressures and circumstances lead an uncertain and harried existence. The continuance of their livelihood is bound up with victory. This situation is hard on men with families to support. They find themselves creating a monster which may well demand them as its appeasing sacrifice.

School administrators share the brunt of the system they help to create. They are blamed for losses. Their accomplishments as educators are often measured by the agility and brawn of some of their students. They are frequently lead into uneasy alliance with rich friends and alumni who demand winning teams as the price of financial assistance.

The student body as a whole is often harmed. Non-athletes see undue privilege and advantage accorded to players. Athletic facilities which should be at the disposal of the student body are sequestered while a small group goes through long hours of gruelling practice. Those who work hard for degrees in courses demanding competency and industry witness at graduation their hard-won baccalaureate shared with others who have devoted their time to courses in rhythmic dancing, camping, and such subjects. While upwards of eighteen semester hours of credit are demanded for most academic degrees, there are cases of programs which require only twelve for athletes, and some of these include credits for practicing for games. Surely policies and practices such as these can bring nothing but dissension to a campus and harm to its personnel.

Many of the more flagrant abuses are not found on a large number of campuses. Some schools make equal demands for scholastic competence upon all students. But there is a marked tendency toward abuses wherever athleticism, or the principle of victory at all costs, has been accepted in practice. Even in schools that demand scholastic competence of athletes, there is a tendency to find a large proportion of these students in the easier courses. Human nature can stand only so much. The long hours of exhausting practice and and the unduly protracted pre-season preparations leave a minimum of time for study. Where athletes are found in courses demanding scholastic competence, it is very common to find their work drop in quality during the seasons of play.

The demands for long practice sessions and adherence to training regulations naturally tend to encourage athletes to form cliques. This anti-social pattern is strengthened by the regimen of athleticism which prevents attendance at many campus activities of a social or intellectual nature, and which sometimes encourages a contemptuous attitude towards such non-athletic endeavors. These pressures deprive many athletes of beneficial educational experiences.

It is both easy and understandable for athletes who engage in commercialized spectacles to conclude that they are making a major contribution to the common good of the school. Thus those among them who are intellectually deficient and those whose opportunities for study are seriously curtailed by training and practice can easily be led to expect academic favor and advantage because of their physical prowess. This reversal of values will find no acceptance in the world in which they must live after school is finished. It is a poor preparation for living.

These are some of the symptoms encountered where athletics have degenerated into athleticism, where the principle of victory at all costs underlies the great interscholastic athletic spectacles. These symptoms are found in every class of college and in the secondary schools as well, where the proselytizing of grammar school children is becoming common.

Proselytizing of athletes, and its attendant practices, have been condemned as means of introducing false standards in the minds of students, and of imparting democracy in education by unduly favoring one group over another. It has been maintained that these practices lead to a debasement of the collegiate degree. But these are not the most serious evils that result. The real harm is done in the moral order, in the realm of the spiritual nature of man.

Naturally enough, the practitioners of athleticism offer some defense of their activities. They argue that the receipts from football and basketball, which are the great money-makers, help to defray the expenses of lesser sports such as swimming, track, and golf. It is reasonable, they say, to spend money to build winning teams that will earn profits wherewith a more varied sports program can be offered to a larger number of students. They say that there is nothing wrong in aiding poor boys to earn an education by participating in athletics. Some find a justification in the need to compete with other schools which are dominated by athleticism.

Clearly, the problem could be argued for generations on these superficial grounds without arriving at any conclusion. But there are certain basic principles which can be applied to this whole question, not only in the interest of making a competent moral judgment of current practice, but of formulating some norms for future guidance as well.

In all questions that affect the scholastic environment, it is most important to keep in mind the nature of the school and its role in the educational process. Now education is an endeavor to improve the young in view of their nature and destiny as human beings. Education does not aim at some passing and transitory change, but rather at a permanent habituation of the individual by which his capacities are to be developed in a permanent and lasting manner. This means that man is to be educated by developing virtues, moral, intellectual, and artistic.

The school owes its origin to a need for a more systematic preparation of the young in those skills and virtues needed for living in a society that has grown more complicated with its development. In another age, the proper preparation of the individual was cared for in the bosom of the family. But the emerging complexities of civil society made increasing demands upon its members. To meet these demands special training was required, and that training was had in schools.[1] The needs of civil society were chiefly intellectual and artistic. Historically, then, the primary and distinctive function of the school was to train the young in the arts and sciences for the advantage and prosperity of civil society.[2] This is also clear from the very appurtenances of the schools, the classroom procedure centering around the curriculum, which are instruments for intellectual and artistic training.

---

[1] Pope Pius XI, *On The Christian Education of Youth* (N.C.W.C. translation), p. 29.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

Man's spiritual nature demands that the training of the schools be imparted in an atmosphere of Christian piety.[3] Because man is social, it is reasonable that the schools should foster some social and recreational activities in the interest of humanizing its environment. Man's physical needs make it reasonable to include a certain amount of physical culture in the school's program. It is clear that athletics have a two-fold title to inclusion among the school's activities, one recreational and social, the other physical. But in all these matters, the primacy of artistic and intellectual education must be maintained, and nothing must be allowed to infringe upon the atmosphere of Christian piety.

Consequently, one may argue from the very nature of the school that certain athletic functions are both necessary and useful. But can this be offered in defense of the production of gigantic spectacles that require vast outlays of money and countless hours of gruelling practice and the host of evils that follow in the wake of athleticism? In what way precisely do competitive interscholastic events carried on in crowded stadiums as commercialized spectacles for the general public, assist an educational institution to create the atmosphere of Christian piety or foster the advance of the arts and sciences? Some may say that the profits thus made are used by the schools to provide better facilities for all the students. But may not one ask if it is just to place the burdens of earning for all on the shoulders of a few? And if this is just, why not send students into factories and mines after school to earn salaries which can be contributed to building funds?

A school is a moral entity endowed with certain corporate rights and duties. A school, then, has a moral obligation to cultivate and foster an atmosphere of virtue and integrity through the direction of its administrators and the corporate activity of its staff and students. Without this effort toward virtue, educational endeavors are doomed. How can this atmosphere of virtue be maintained when agreements in favor of amateur standards are freely entered into and then slyly broken? It is surely an offense against equity for a school to thrust an undue portion of the burden of supporting its endeavors, howsoever praiseworthy, upon a few students who happen to belong to teams.

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

In his treatise on temperance, St. Thomas speaks of man's obligation to maintain his honor, which is a tribute accorded to the excellence of his virtue.[4] All men reasonably expect that a school should do the same. We hear much of the honorable traditions of "Alma Mater." Only honorableness could explain the use of the adjective "Alma" by reasonable and well-disposed men. Honorableness consists fundamentally in internal perfections, but it can be manifested only by external actions.[5] The principal honor of a school is had by manifesting an atmosphere of Christian piety and by educating the young in the arts and sciences. Without this fundamental honorableness, nothing else is of value in a school, and substitutes must always be a sham and a kind of hypocrisy. The school is a Christian academic institution. To secure athletic eminence has nothing to do with academic honorableness. And to secure such eminence by passing off professionalized players as amateurs, or by engaging in any other activities of athleticism, is contrary to virtue whether in or out of the academic environment. Athleticism is a positive and immoral impediment to the work which the school should be doing for the young in the interest of the common good.

The whole pattern of virtuous loyalty, respect, and gratitude which should bind a student to his school is comprised under the virtue of piety, which includes also the student's duties to his parents and his country. When a student sees that his school works on the principle of victory at all costs; when a student sees that his school encourages competition beyond reason; when a student sees that his school trafficks in athleticism to gain money and fame, then he is being scandalized by the activities of the institution that should edify him. Deceit, bribery and hypocrisy practiced in the interest of greed and vain-glory are both un-Christian and impious. And these are some of the results of athleticism.

There is an assumption that the practices of athleticism have something to do with student recreation. No one can reasonably maintain that all recreation is inimical to the academic environment. But the extent of recreation on a campus must be measured against the purpose of the school and the moral principles governing recreation.

---

[4] *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 145, a. 1.

[5] *Ibid.*, a. 2.

If the principal purpose of schools were to provide recreation for their students or for the public at large, vast sums could be conserved by eliminating from them expensive educational paraphernalia and by dismissing all students who do not qualify as members of teams, bands, and cheering-sections. The number of faculty members could be reduced to the minimum necessary to afford these few students some kind of occupational therapy between contests or in the off-seasons.

The absurdity of this supposition shows that the recreational activities of the schools must be regulated virtuously just as the recreation of individuals. St. Thomas shows that recreation is necessary for the soul just as rest is for the body, because both are finite and limited in the amount of work they can do and the amount of strain they can edure. Rest for the soul is to be found in lawful pleasure, and some form of this is needed by all men.[6] In fact, he teaches that to refuse to recreate or to impede the lawful recreation of others is a vice called boorishness.[7]

Now several questions arise about the morality of the recreational aspects of interscholastic athletic competition. These games involve the school precisely as a moral entity, the players, the non-playing students, and the general public. Whatever is done for recreation must be in keeping with the dignity and vocation of those concerned.[8] In the light of this principle, it is difficult to see how a school can be morally free to engage professionally in providing recreation for the general public. Such a function is unbecoming to the purpose of an educational institution, and there is no precedent for it in the long history of education. Would it not appear strange for a school to own and operate a professional baseball team or a racing stable to provide recreation for its students or the public at large? Yet how does this differ from the current practice of paying for and demanding professional athletic services from a limited number of students? The very size of the stadiums, the sale of broadcasting and television rights, and the amount of travel to play games clearly indicate that the schools intend to play to larger audiences than could be made up of students and alumni. Clearly they are in the entertainment business. Equally clearly, this has nothing to do with their essential purpose as institutions of learning.

---

[6] *Ibid.*, q. 168, a. 2.

[7] *Ibid.*, a. 4.

[8] *Ibid.*, a. 3.

The practice of providing spectacles for the recreation of the public is good in itself when abuses are excluded. It is likewise reasonable for some men to engage professionally in providing recreation for their fellows.[9] The question centers around the propriety and morality of schools entering this business and of using their students to engage in commercialized entertainment. Of course, when hypocrisy, fraud, subornation and deceit are used to continue the production of athletic spectacles, they must be condemned out of hand as grossly immoral, whether they be employed by schools or others.

There can be no doubt that the student body derives certain benefits from witnessing athletic contests engaged in by their schoolmates. Certain corporate activity is thus encouraged, the virtue of loyalty is exercised and examples of co-operation and courage are held up for admiration and emulation. But these good results can be secured through athletic programs that have nothing to do with athleticism. In fact, athleticism robs these contests of whatever beneficial effect they might have on the student body. Students must realize that there is an aura of deceit about the whole business. The players are bought and paid for. The teams play in great arenas where the seats are so priced that the students are often relegated to poorer sections, unless they belong to the cheering-section, in which case they get good seats because they are being used to contribute to the spectacle. The team travels far and only a few wealthy students can afford to witness the games played away from school. The majority must be content with newspaper accounts and the newsreels or television. They are presented with the sight of physically mature men, their elders and supposed leaders, exulting wildly in trivialities. Any student so naive as to suppose that all this is done for his benefit is simply stupid, and scarcely a fit subject for higher education.

The players can hardly be thought to be recreating in the spectacles of athleticism. One glance at the average practice session preparatory to interscholastic competition will convince the onlooker that there is no spirit of recreation here. The atmosphere evoked, the methods bordering on brutality that are sometimes employed are hardly to be associated with relaxation for the soul or with the environment of Christian piety.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, a. 3, ad 3.

During seasons of play, an athlete will be expected to devote as much or more time to his games than to his studies. Coaches pressured into winning games will have little sympathy for teachers who make even ordinary demands of athletes. These attitudes will naturally create an atmosphere in which study is regarded as an undue interference with athleticism. The athlete paid to attend an institution supposedly dedicated to teaching him something soon learns that "it was not for knowledge that he came to college." Under the regime of athleticism, the schools' interest is to gain victory before large, paying audiences; the coaches' business is to win games, not to train students. It had better be the player's interest to win, too. That is what he is paid for. He is free to study or do whatever else he may wish, provided it does not interfere with his playing. Athleticism bestows exaggerated amounts of time and opportunity for recreation and games on the professionalized athletes who need it least. But its purpose is not recreation. No one can make a sane defense of such practices as pertaining to Christian recreation.

The player's soul is not rested by such excesses. If anything, he is harrassed and exhausted. Coaching methods are sometimes brutalizing; the irascible appetites are stirred up to fever pitch; in some cases, foul play is taught and encouraged. St. Thomas clearly states that recreation becomes sinful when it is secured through " . . . indecent words or deeds, or such as are injurious to one's neighbor, because these things of themselves are mortal sins."[10]

These excesses are ancient. Aristotle speaks of certain states which seem to take greatest care of their children. Some of these " . . . aim at producing in them an athletic habit, but they only injure their forms and stunt their growth."[11] He decries the practices of the Lacedaemonian schools wherein ". . . they brutalize their children by laborious exercises which they think will make them courageous."[12]

Some have advanced the argument that games are an aid to chastity for young men, and they quote the authority of St. Thomas to support this statement. While it is true that in his counsels for preserving the angelic virtue he mentions "moderate bodily toil," this cannot be construed to mean the exhausting and excessive activities of athleticism.[13] The Saint wrote in terms of his own experience, and there is no historical evidence to support the theory that he ever witnessed anything comparable to our contemporary spectacles of athleticism. If the context of his thought is consulted, a different teaching is noted. He clearly states that an inordinate attachment to play withdraws man from his duties and begets a moral softness which is contrary to perseverance.[14] Without perserverance, chastity is impossible. This same doctrine is reflected in the writings of Dr. Rudolph Allers, who says that the tensions produced by athletic competitions often directly cause acts contrary to chastity as a means of relief.[15]

---

[10] *Ibid.,* a. 3.
[11] *Pol.,* VIII, 138b, 10.
[12] *Ibid.,* 12.

It cannot be denied that competitive sports afford the participants many opportunities for exercising virtues that would otherwise be neglected. But it must be remembered that these athletic competitions provide only the material element, the stuff on which virtue can be practiced. The formal, essential element of virtue is found in the rectitude of the will and the moderation of the passions, and this is a spiritual work. Of themselves, athletic contests have no sacramental efficacy. They become beneficial only when those concerned are properly instructed, motivated, and directed. Here again, the practices of athleticism are certain to instill vice rather than virtue. The increasing intensity of competition gains a peculiar momentum, a kind of lust for victory that leaves little room for the freedom of virtue.

The general public gains nothing in the way of recreation from spectacles provided commercially by the schools that it could not have from acknowledged professional players. Those who think they are seeing a group of eager youngsters playing their hearts out for love just do not know what is going on. The chance of witnessing a truly amateur contest among colleges and universities is small indeed, and it is decreasing steadily even among the high schools. The current scandals involving college players and the whole pattern of athleticism show that the general public is being made party to a vicious enterprise that is gnawing at the vitals of the educational system of this country. The public is paying far more than scalpers' prices for the games they are seeing.

---

[13] *Opusc. XVIII, De Vita Religiosa,* ch. 9.

[14] *Sum. theol.,* II-II, q. 138, a. 1, ad 3.

[15] Rudolph Allers, M.D., Ph.D., *Character Education in Adolescence* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1940), pp. 128 ff.

The following summary conclusions may be made regarding the morality of interscholastic competition:

(1) Properly regulated games are a legitimate form of recreation and are conducive to good health and school spirit. Such games can be made a valuable instrument for the practice of virtue and the creation of the atmosphere of Christian piety so necessary in the schools. It is therefore most reasonable to provide an athletic program in the schools, and to integrate this with co-curricular activities. The primary purpose of such co-curricular athletics will be to contribute to the health of all the students, to develop motor skills, to foster the co-operative virtues and to solidify the spirit of solidarity on the campus. Interscholastic competitions are not necessary to secure these ends. The benefits of athletics can be made available to the student body generally by a carefully planned intramural program.

(2) Competition injects a note of zeal into athletics and generally persuades more students to participate in games. Consequently, a well-regulated program of intramural competitive games will bring many benefits to great numbers of students who would probably neglect athletic opportunities were it not for the element of competition.

(3) Interscholastic competitions concentrate on the development of a small minority of the students whose temperament and ability is such that they need no encouragement to participate in games. This kind of competition does nothing for the athletic development of the general run of students. Considering the school as a moral entity, a moral person, the chief value of such competition is the promotion of unity and spirit and the exhibition of skill and courage for the admiration and emulation of the student body. These advantages can be secured through intramural programs. If circumstances demand or allow for intrascholastic competition for the above-mentioned ends, it must be so conducted that the moral tone of the campus is improved and the student body does not suffer from bad example or unreasonable denial of access to athletic facilities.

(4) The proper and immediate object of competitive sports is victory. But victory must be sought according to the circumstances of place and person involved.

(a) To proselytize athletes contrary to lawful agreement is immoral because it is a species of fraud. The practice of proselytizing athletes is frequently immoral and always dangerous because it generally leads to a betrayal of honorableness and to excesses against temperance in recreation.

(b) School administrators have a positive duty, flowing from the obligation of the school to manifest its honorableness as a moral entity, to prevent connivance by interested parties to engage in proselytizing athletes.

(c) In all athletic endeavors it is to be remembered that the primary function of the school is to teach. Therefore, it is immoral for school authorities to permit or to encourage treatment of athletes that hinders their vocation as students. Thus, to admit the academically incompetent for purposes of strengthening teams is wrong. To allow long hours of gruelling practice, the lengthening of pre-season practice and the segregation of athletes from other activities is also wrong.

(d) The livelihood of coaches must not be made insecure by excessive emphasis on victory. When the foregoing moral principles are followed, victory will depend upon the best use of whatever material presents itself, and this use will be regulated by Christian principles that forbid excess. Consequently, the coaches must be expected to have a certain knowledge of their business and a certain skill in handling and inspiring students. The standards of employment and retention applied to other faculty members must be applied to them. Victory cannot be made the sole or principal condition of continuance, because such emphasis on victory practically demands the immoralities of athleticism.

(e) Training methods that brutalize players, that encourage foul play or that create situations or attitudes inimical to study and other, non-athletic phases of student life must never be tolerated. Such practices are contrary to the nature of the student vocation, the dignity of the human person and the Christian principles of recreation.

(5) In view of human frailty it will generally prove imprudent to allow the receipts of the more profitable sports to finance the lesser

games and teams. This generally leads to athleticism in an effort to fill the coffers and thus to spread the immorality of unrestricted competition and the un-Christian principle of victory at all costs.

It is clear that the application of these principles would change the present pattern of interscholastic athletics. The use of immoral means of proselytizing can lead to nothing but grave scandals. It will always remain difficult for the young who have been bribed to win to refuse another bribe to win within a certain margin, or even to lose. No school whose athletic activities and practices can not stand moral scrutiny will ever exert a full measure of the proper influence on its students. People are more prone to follow practices than precepts. If the practices of the athletic departments are to be harmonized with the precepts of the curriculum in the interest of making the school a true sanctuary of educational influence, then some of the following suggestions are worthy of attention.

(1) Interscholastic athletics must cease to be a form of public recreation and a source of great profit for the schools. Whatever games are played between schools should be staged in moderation and primarily for the benefit and recreation of the students and alumni.

(2) Intramural programs and competitions should be emphasized; while interscholastic competition should be curtailed.

(3) If a school is frankly dependent upon athletic revenues, let them be made without endangering the purposes of schooling and the well-being of the students. A wise investment in an *avowedly* commercial enterprise avoids this danger. Something like this could be worked out: The athletic department of the school could be divided into two distinct offices, totally independent of each other. One would care for the true athletic needs of the school by providing intramural and co-curricular athletic activities. This office would retain the name of the athletic department, and would operate on a budget furnished by the administration just like any academic department.

The other athletic office would be placed in the department of public relations. This office would be given means to secure the services of professional players who would not have to be enrolled as students. The function of this office would be to earn fame and money for the schools. Students could be admitted to their contests at reduced prices, or even gratis if they were in the band or cheering section which would be furnished by the school to add color and to manifest their ownership of the professional team. The specific purpose of these teams would be identical with that of professional baseball teams or racing stables that the school might purchase. Identical methods would be employed.

(4) All secondary school administrators must resist the efforts of proselytizers from the colleges. To co-operate with them either actively or passively is to become party to a vicious system that is a public scandal.

(5) Every encouragement in the form of scholarships and grants-in-aid must be made to the academically competent who are deserving; but such aid must never be used to foster athleticism.

THOMAS C. DONLAN, O.P.

St. Dominic's Priory
Oak Park, Illinois

THE CHURCH'S SPIRITUALITY AND VISIBILITY

If we consider the chief end of this Church and the proximate efficient causes of salvation, it is undoubtedly *spiritual;* but in regard to those who constitute it, and to the things which lead to these spiritual gifts, it is *external* and necessarily visible. The apostles received a mission to teach by visible and audible signs, and they discharged their mission only by words and acts which certainly appealed to the senses. So that their voices falling upon the ears of those who heard them begot faith in souls—*Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.* And faith itself—that is assent given to the first and supreme truth—though residing essentially in the intellect, must be manifested by outward profession—*For, with the heart, we believe unto justice; but with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation.* In the same way, nothing is more internal than heavenly grace which begets sanctity, but the ordinary and chief means of obtaining grace are external: that is to say, the sacraments which are administered by men specially chosen for that purpose, by means of certain ordinances.

—Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Satis cognitum,* issued on June 20, 1896. The translation is taken from *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York, 1903), p. 352.

JEAN JACQUES OLIER AND DEVOTION TO MARY

The devotion to our Blessed Mother of Jean Jacques Olier, seventeenth century founder of the Society of St. Sulpice, at first might be considered a matter of esoteric interest of little relevance to the devotional life of the American cleric, and still less to the devotional life of the American Catholic, whose spiritual formation is so dependent on that cleric. But inasmuch as Sulpician seminaries, in which devotion to Mary is a sacred tradition, have been the training grounds of countless numbers of our diocesan clergy since 1791, the love of Mary in Catholic devotional life cannot be completely dissociated from the apparently remote phenomenon of the love of a French cleric for the exquisite Maiden beneath whose heart the Son of God found first earthly sanctuary.[1]

Like his confreres of the French School, De Bérulle and De Condren, Father Olier was not a Scholastic theologian in the technical sense of the word, but like them, he had a simple and almost childlike love of Mary which is manifested in an inchoate Mariology to be found in his writings.[2]

It is impossible to consider any significant decision in the life of Jean Jacques Olier without noting the influence of his Heavenly Mother. The so-called "conversion" of the fastidious young Abbé Olier in 1630 to what was to become a life of consecrated service to the diocesan priesthood was initiated by a pilgrimage to Mary's famous shrine at Loreto. The spiritually immature young aristocrat, having completed his baccalaureate studies at the Sorbonne with an insouciant brilliance, had gone to Rome to become a specialist in Hebrew when failing sight compelled him to abandon his studies. In the *Santa Casa* at Loreto, which an old legend claimed was the house of the Incarnation, a greater vision, spiritual as well as physical, was given him, and Jean Jacques Olier was committed in heart as well as in word to the service of his Lord.

---

[1] *Pensées choisies sur le culte de Notre-Seigneur, de la Sainte Vièrge, des anges, et des saints.* Edited by G. Letourneau (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1922), p. 99.

[2] Cf. *Doctrine de M. Olier.* By H. I. Icard (Paris: Séminaire de Saint Sulpice, 1889). Chapters VI, VII, VIII; *Vie Intérieure de la Très-Sainte Vièrge, ouvrage recueilli des écrits de M. Olier* (Rome: Salviucci, 1886). 2 vols. The Marian writings of St. Louis Marie Grignon de Monfort, alumnus of St. Sulpice, show a definite influence of Father Olier and the French school.

Perhaps Father Olier turned to Mary, whom he called his "blessed princess," because of the intransigeant ambition of his mother, who substituted for maternal solicitude an almost frenetic desire for prelatial honors for her son. His repeated prayer, "I take you for my mother, as mine rejects me," has a certain poignancy that reminds one of the sadness of Saint Thomas when the wrathful Countess Theodora of Aquino tried to thwart his legitimate religious aspirations. Jean Jacques, as well as Thomas, sought a nobility which their mothers' kind of nobility could neither envision nor appreciate.

Father Olier always remained a dutiful son to his spiritual mother. We see him amid the chill winds of winter and in the oppressive heat of the summer making his way in pilgrimage to Our Lady of Chartres and to Our Lady of Liesse. In passing through Saumur, he could be found paying homage to Our Lady of Ardillières at Anjou on the banks of the Loire. In his moments of desolation as well as in his hours of joy, he could be found at some shrine of his "blessed princess." It was in front of the altar of Our Lady in the crypt at Chartres that the light of a mother's love dispelled the four year darkness of a bitter and humiliating trial which had all but destroyed his spiritual and physical vigor.

Before founding the seminary at Vaugirard, he went on pilgrimage to Our Lady of Virtues in Aubervilliers where his dear friend De Condren had gone so often before him. And the Paris seminary, destined to inaugurate a new era in post-Tridentine seminary reform, opened its doors on the Feast of Our Lady's Assumption.[3]

Each month on the first Saturday in his new parish dedicated to Mary, Mass and procession were held in her honor, and the first communicants were formally committed to her care—a custom which later spread far beyond the confines of Saint Sulpice. The very parish was divided in sections named after mysteries of Mary.

---

[3] For the relation of De Condren and Olier, cf. *The Priesthood in the Writings of the French School: Bérulle, De Condren, Olier.* By Eugene A. Walsh, S.S., S.T.D. (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1949).

These devotional practices were significant at this time, as the Jansenists, who often did violence to Catholics as they did violence to Catholicism, attacked bitterly devotion to Our Lady as well as devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.[4]

In the young Seminary of Saint Sulpice, the seminarians were taught that the Christ-life was exquisitely mirrored in Mary, whose dispositions to God and to neighbor were like those of her Divine Son. Father Olier was gifted with an almost eidetic capacity to visualize our Blessed Mother, and to help his students visualize the glory of her inner life he commissioned the artist LeBrun to prepare engravings for the seminary.

It is significant too that Father Olier chose the Feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin as the time for the renewal of clerical promises, because the consecration of the youthful Mary was to him the spirit of complete devotedness that should characterize the aspirant to the priestly life. The renewal of clerical promises took place for the first time in Paris in 1650 in the presence of the Papal Nuncio; and from that year to this priests grown old in the service of the Lord as well as tonsured youth have pledged before the altars of their *alma mater* on the Feast of the Presentation that the Lord is the portion of their inheritance.[5]

It goes without saying that after his devotion to Our Lord, Father Olier's devotion to Mary was the most substantial reality in his spiritual life. But in no sense, can his devotion to her be construed as a vague sentimentalism. He was specifically interested in these factors: the role of the Mother of God in the plan of Divine Providence; in what sense she could be considered a Spouse of the Heavenly Father; her role in the Incarnation; and her part in the mission of the Holy Ghost among souls.[6]

Father Olier loved and honored Mary quite simply because in the provident plan of Almighty God she was an object of divine love. And his frequent references to Our Blessed Mother as the

---

[4] *Life of Father Olier*. By Pierre Pourrat, S.S. Reilly translation. (Baltimore: The Voice Publishing Co., 1932), p. 155.

[5] Pourrat, *op cit.*, p. 197. Father Olier had established the seminary of Nantes the previous year. He opened the seminary of Viviers in 1650, and that of Le Puy in 1652.

[6] Icard, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

Spouse of the Eternal Father indicate that he paid her homage under this title much as the giants of medieval theology had done before him.[7]

The role of Mary in the Incarnation is an obvious one which demands little elaboration by Father Olier or anyone else, but the founder of St. Sulpice emphasized the fact that since the closeness of Jesus and Mary is a fact historically, it should be recognized in our devotions. He pointed out too that Mary was the recipient of the choicest gifts of the Holy Ghost, recalling her presence in the Cenacle with the Apostles on the Feast of Pentecost. It was at his suggestion that the central portrait of the seminary chapel depicted the Queen of the Clergy, filled with the Holy Ghost acting as a channel by which heaven's gifts are distributed to Christ's ministers and to the faithful.[8]

But perhaps a symbol of Jean Jacques Olier's devotion to Mary can be found in a prayer in honor and in imitation of the interior life of Jesus and of Mary; an exquisite prayer said with as much fidelity by seminarians in the twentieth century as it was in the seventeenth:

> O Jesus, living in Mary, come and live in thy servants in the spirit of thy sanctity, in the fullness of thy power, in the perfection of thy ways, in the truth of thy virtues, and in the communion of thy mysteries. Triumph over all adverse powers in the Holy Spirit for the glory of thy Father.

In Father Olier's thought, when we try to reflect the Mother as the Mother reflected her Son, then we will be worthy subjects of heaven's Queen.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[7] Cf. Albert the Great, *Opera Alberti*, T. XII, Sermo 38; Saint Thomas, *Opera omnia*, T. XVIII, Sermo Dominicae IV quadrigesimae; Saint Bonaventure, *Opuscula Sancti* Bonaventurae (Paris: 1647), I, 518.

[8] Pourrat, *op. cit.* p. 282.

A QUEST OF THOUGHTS

PART V

THE TWO FEARS

Many men today have two fears that are in a way contradictory: they fear the particular and they fear the general. They fly from general principles or say that there are no such things. But at the same time they can shrink from particular applications and concrete instances. They are as ready and determined to deny the individual as they are the universal.

This fear of the general is seen in the legal positivism that prevails today in America. There is no natural law; all that exists in the realm of law is a collection of positive enactments. The same opinion holds among moralists. There is nothing basic and absolute in the moral order. It is only human thinking and human doing that make things good or bad. There are no absolutes, but only what is relative. There is nothing universal, but only the invididual and the particular. Nominalism of the crudest sort is the only acceptable philosophy.

The opposing characteristic of the modern mind is found in its fear of everything affirmed by the first doctrine. It may be thought that the dominance of the physical sciences, of "scientific method," and of concern for the material and the sensible things would make for the reverse, that is, for a demand that things be clear and definite. Yet the fear of the particular and of the definite exists and manifests itself in countless ways.

In our time, as in past times, men are concerned for human freedom. What we have witnessed of slavery and what others have suffered as slaves has made freedom appear even more clearly for what it is, the highest of goods and the source of all others. All men must be free, everywhere throughout the world—which of us will deny this? Yet there are those who speak most authoritatively for the modern mind and they will deny that the individual man does or can possess freedom of will. Freedom in general, freedom in the mass, freedom in the abstract is extolled. But freedom in the definite and particular, freedom in the individual men and women who actually exist, is denied and even vilified.

What of the existence of God? There are those who deny that God, a being infinite, all good, all-wise, the beginning and end of all things, exists. Yet they are ready and anxious to admit that the universe is divine. God, one, unique, undivided, does not exist, but everything is God.

The same attitude of mind is apparent with regard to the divinity of Jesus Christ. Christ, according to the teaching of traditional Christianity, is true God and true man. He is one single person in whom are united divine nature and human nature. It is to avoid ambiguity and obscurity that the Church expresses this basic doctrine in such clear and explicit terms. In flight from the definite and the particular are those who deny that Christ is God in the Church's unequivocal sense, and prefer to talk about the divinity that is in us all.

SANTAYANA AND EMERSON

George Santayana has spent his last years in Rome in the hospital of the Little Company of Mary, a community of Irish and English nuns. He has been quoted as saying that he can endure the human race when at a distance from it. Santayana echoes Emerson: "I love Man but not men."

Both Santayana and Emerson are philosophers. The materialist is a philosopher by profession; the idealist is only an amateur. Does either of them suspect what a commentary his words are upon his own character and thought? Santayana, according to his own principles, must recognize that men are the highest of beings. He has written about his reverence of the universe and about the unconquerable individual. But this materialism seems to leave him in his old age little reverence or love for his fellow men.

Emerson was fonder of phrases than of realities. Perhaps a question never rose in his mind about his own sincerity of thought. Yet it would have taken only a little reflection to bring home the truth that Man as such, man with a capital M, does not live and that love of Man in the general and abstract is a spurious affair. If Emerson cannot love the individual human beings, the real men and women with their defects of body and soul who alone exist, his love of Man is only a delusion and a snare.

The only one who can admit to a love of Man is the one who loves and serves his fellows not merely in spite of what they are as concrete individuals but rather for what they are as real human beings. It is the nun who cooks Santayana's meals, washes his clothes, makes his bed, and nurses him when he is ill, and prays for him, who can be said to love Man. She does this for Santayana because of what he is physically, and mentally, and spiritually. She does it because he is a man, her brother, a brother of Jesus Christ, and a child of Almighty God.

The doctor, the nurse, the missioner, the priest, and countless others who are willing to recognize their own defects and the defects of other human beings like themselves, who see these things clearly and yet bind themselves in service to their fellow men, these alone can be said to love Man. But such unselfish men and women in the midst of their repugnant and arduous tasks in behalf of other men and women would not even think of what the pseudo philosopher expresses in so revealing a fashion.

MERE PIETY AND MERE SHOW

I have heard of an old and experienced priest who is quoted as saying, "I always suspect a man who does things for the love of God," and of another who says, "I have noticed that pious people are always very careful of themselves."

What the first is hitting at in a vein of mild cynicism is clear. Most of us have very personal and selfish motives in doing things, and the man who proclaims his complete unselfishness may well be suspected of hiding a petty interest of his own under a cloak of sanctity. There are plenty of people who are doing things for the love of God, but they do not proclaim their lofty motives and the purity of their intentions. If the motives of the saints themselves are sometimes suspected, it is one of the penalties they have to pay for being genuine.

In a sense the second epigram contains even more truth than the first. There are more pious people than there are hypocrites. It is a good thing that this is so, but the fact adds quantitatively, as it were, to the truth contained within the observation. A man who is pious, but merely pious, is inclined to be self-centered, to be concerned with his round of prayers and pious practices, and to be fearful of doing wrong rather than eager to do good. Mere piety can become a mild form of egoism in which a man is primarily concerned with his own safety, advantage, and ease. It can result in the delusion that we are doing our complete duty. We can readily arrive at the thought that we are doing as much as we are called upon to do. It is self-regarding and self-satisfying, rather than generous, other-regarding and self-sacrificing.

Contrast the saint and the merely pious man or woman. We cannot even think of the saints as being pious. The man who rises to the heights of heroic sanctity spends himself in prayer and in labor in such manner that mere piety has no place in his life. Take any random list of saints—Patrick, Francis of Assisi, Francis de Sales, Francis Xavier, the Curé of Ars, and the Little Flower—and what we can see in their lives is a complete forgetfulness of self, a will to spend themselves entirely for the love of God and of their fellow men. They alone know what all this costs them in pain and effort. We cannot estimate such things, but we can know how little the saints care for themselves. Of them alone can it be said that they are willing to live dangerously as far as the world and its goods are concerned. But in the happiness that possesses them we can see how they receive because they give and how they live because they love their lives in Christ.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

MARY OUR EXEMPLAR

But when we point out Mary as the model for man's imitation and the object of his reverence, we are simply bringing him into closer relation with his Creator. She is the bridge, so to speak, over which there is a direct leading to the Kingdom of her divine Son for which we daily pray that it may come. And surely there is not an ideal, a love so worthy of our admiration, a life so fair and stainless as hers whom even the Archangel salutes as "full of grace"; concerning whom the seer of old, enraptured by her vision, asks: "Who is she that cometh as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array?"

—Father Heuser, in his article "Maria Regina Cleri," in the May, 1891 *AER*, p. 326.

RECENT WORKS IN FUNDAMENTAL DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

During the past few years there has been a great deal of excellent writing in the field of fundamental dogmatic theology. One of the best of these recent productions covers the entire field. It is the first volume of the *Sacrae theologiae summa*, a four-volume work being written by Jesuit professors of theology in Spain.[1] The introduction to theology, the apologetics, and the section on Holy Scripture are written by Fr. Michael Nicolau, of the Jesuit house of studies in Granada, long famous for the production of the *Archivo teologico Granadino*. The treatise on the Church is the work of Fr. Joachim Salaverri, of the Society's magnificent faculty in Comillas.

The work of Nicolau and Salaverri is doctrinally sure and is magnificently documented. Indeed, there is no equally acceptable textbook of fundamental dogmatic theology available today. The writers have referred to the most important contemporary European sources in their brilliant explanations and demonstrations. They have enriched their book with a strikingly complete and useful series of bibliographies. Most important of all, their teaching is doctrinally sound and their use of the various *loci theologici* exceptionally competent and complete.

As this book stands it is an ideal seminary manual. It is also a volume which the priest in parochial work can use easily and most profitably for that progress in that science of sacred theology which is part of a well-ordered sacerdotal life.

A great many years have passed since any book has been described on the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* as one which "should be in every priest's library." Perhaps that expression was used too frequently and sometimes injudiciously in times past. Certainly and in all justice it is applicable to the work of these two Spanish theologians.

---

[1] *Sacrae theologiae summa. I. Introductio in theologiam. De revelatione christiana. De ecclesia Christi. De. S. Scriptura*, by Fr. Michael Nicolau, S.J. and Fr. Joachim Salaverri, S.J. (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1950), pp. xx+1131.

Likewise an excellent textbook, but drawn up along lines quite different from those of the *Sacrae theologiae summa*, is the *Theologia fundamentalis* of Rome's famed Msgr. Pietro Parente.[2] Where the Spanish Jesuits have written as complete a manual as possible, Msgr. Parente has aimed at conciseness, and has produced one of the most practical classroom texts of our time. Sometimes, however, as in the case of his bibliographies, Msgr. Parente has manifestly carried his enthusiasm for brevity to extremes.

His doctrine is scrupulously exact. He crowds his apologetics into a mere fifty-eight pages, and thus makes no attempt to acquaint his readers with more than the bare outline of this part of sacred theology. His treatment of the Church is more extensive, and is remarkable for the clarity and the accuracy of its theses and the force of its demonstrations.

Msgr. Parente has likewise taken a leading part in the writing and editing of the *Dizionario di teologia dommatica*, working with two of his colleagues, Antonio Piolanti and Salvatore Garofalo.[3] This excellent work is intended primarily for the laity. It is, however, eminently useful as a reference work for priests. Dr. Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., of the Catholic University faculty of sacred theology has done an eminently useful work by translating it into English.[4] The translated *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* is, fortunately, more than a merely mechanical rendition of the original into the English language. Dr. Doronzo has taken care to enlarge the bibliographies so as to refer to works available to our readers. His translation is one of the most valuable additions to English theological literature in many years.

Several important works on the concept and the method of sacred theology have appeared recently. Easily the most important and the most erudite of these is the *Introductio in sacram*

---

[2] *Theologia fundamentalis. Apologetica-De ecclesia*, by Msgr. Pietro Parente (Turin: Marietti, 1946), pp. ix+223. This work is the first volume of the *Collectio theologica Romana*.

[3] *Dizionario di teologia dommatica*, by Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, 2nd edition (Rome: Editrice Studium, 1945), pp. xxi+284.

[4] *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology*, by Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti, and Salvatore Garofalo, translated from the second Italian edition by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1951), pp. xxvi+310.

theologiam, by Fr. Bartholomew M. Xiberta, O. Carm.[5] Like Fathers Salaverri and Nicolau, Fr. Xiberta has written a complete treatise. Perhaps the feature most valuable to the American student of theology is his explanation of the "new theology," the collection of teachings out of which many of the propositions reproved in the *Humani generis* were taken. Fr. Xiberta gives a courteous and entirely dispassionate account of the principal tenets of many of the most widely discussed recent writers on theological subjects in Europe.

There are, however, some of Fr. Xiberta's own theses which many of our own teachers will be inclined to question. Thus, for example, he seems to go somewhat beyond his evidence when he teaches, (pp. 195 ff.), that there is no such thing as fundamental theology in the strict sense of the term. It would appear that he gives this term a meaning it has never carried in the literature of sacred theology, and then rejects the term itself because of this meaning.

He restricts the application of the traditional thesis on the unity of sacred theology to dogmatic theology alone. He is likewise inclined to multiply distinctions when he comes to explain the various categories of statements that enter into the fabric of his science.

Despite certain deficiencies, however, Fr. Xiberta's treatise is one of the most valuable works on the nature of theology available today. His bibliographies, as far as continental European literature is concerned, are superb. His historical judgments are profound and accurate.

Another excellent, but much more succinct treatise on the same subject is the *Introductio in sacram theologiam*[6] of the Servite Father Gabriel Roschini, famed for his studies in Mariology. Fr. Roschini's book is less documented than Fr. Xiberta's, but his conclusions are adequate and accurate. In the question about the definability of theological conclusions, he tends to follow Fr. Marin-Sola, but believes that the controversy on this point was concerned principally with terms. His treatment of the definitions of sacred theology is the best part of the book. Unfortunately, he takes no cognizance of any theological literature in the English language.

---

[5] *Introductio in sacram theologiam*, by Fr. Bartholomew M. Xiberta (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones cientificas, Patronato "Raimundo Lullo," Instituto "Francisco Suarez," 1949), pp. 371.

[6] *Introductio in sacram theologiam*, by Fr. Gabriel M. Roschini (Rome: Catholic Book Agency, 1947), pp. 112.

An excellent popular work on this subject is Fr. Valentino Vailati's *Introduzione allo studio della teologia cattolica*, the first volume of a complete course in advanced religious education.[7] It is a simplified, and sometimes a bit over-simplified, presentation of the theses found in the professional works, like those of Xiberta and Roschini. Fr. Charles Journet's *Introduction à la théologie*, on the other hand, is more original in design.[8] He deals first with that knowledge of faith which comes by way of the gift of wisdom rather than through the *habitus* of sacred theology. Then he examines the concept of theology itself, with special emphasis on its doctrinal and historical implications. Finally he deals with philosophy, as a wisdom in its own right, and as one of the *loci theologici*. In treating of the condition of the dissidents or non Catholics (pp. 244 f.), Fr. Journet does not seem to place sufficient stress on the Church's real necessity for salvation.

Despite the manifestly laudable intentions of its authors, both Catholic and non-Catholic, the symposium *Unité chretienne et tolérance religieuse* is vitiated by inaccurate ecclesiology.[9] The key essay in this collection is Fr. Max Pribilla's "Intolérance dogmatique et tolérance civile," an article in which the author quotes affirmations of doctrinal intolerance by two Protestant writers, and considers these statements as identical with the Catholic position.[10]

The Protestants held that no one could exact or demand dogmatic tolerance from any church because each believes that it possesses, in every one of its dogmas, a treasure of truth which must not be lost. The Catholic, on the other hand, is aware of the fact that the message proposed by the Church as divine revelation actually is the one true supernatural body of truth communicated by God through His divine Son as His teaching, necessary for all men.

---

[7] *Introduzione allo studio della teologia cattolica*, by Valentino Vailati (Alba: Edizioni Paoline, 1948), pp. 191. This is the first volume of a *Corso di Cultura superiore Religiosa*.

[8] *Introduction à la théologie*, by Charles Journet (Paris: Desclée, De Brouwer, et Cie, 1947), pp. 331.

[9] *Unité chrétienne et tolérance religieuse*: *Dialogues* (Paris: Éditions du Temps Présent, 1950), pp. 310.

[10] *Ibid.*, pp. 147-72.

The attitude expressed by the Protestant writers whom Fr. Pribilla quotes is perfectly in accord with the traditional theory of the Reformers about the nature and function of religious organizations within their company. These men taught that such societies were acceptable as communities within which Christians, members of the true *ecclesia Christi*, could live and work. Their central tenet was the doctrine that the *ecclesia* itself was essentially invisible, that is, not an organization at all.

The divinely revealed but distinctly unfashionable truth of the matter, however, is that the true *ecclesia*, the kingdom of God, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, is actually an organization, a society in which good members are mixed with bad, and that this society or company is the Catholic Church itself. It is likewise a fact that Our Lord Himself is the supreme Teacher within this society. Hence it is only to be expected that the attitude of the Church and of its members towards Catholic dogma will be and must be something quite different from the attitudes of other religious units with reference to their own doctrine. Any attempt to make it appear that these attitudes are similar or identical can only cause confusion among Catholics and among those non-members of the Church who are seeking to learn its teachings.

Those who have followed the controversy in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* and elsewhere about the duties of states towards the Catholic Church will be interested in and enlightened by the recently published second edition of Fr. Lawrence Sotillo's *Compendium iuris publici ecclesiastici.*[11] This book, the latest of the brilliant series being published by the Jesuit faculty of Comillas in Spain, discusses and adversely criticizes Fr. Murray's article, printed in last May's issue of *AER*. Fr. Sotillo's teaching on Church and state is characterized by careful documentation and keen theological insight. He is severe, but eminently accurate, just, and courteous, in his evaluation of Maritain's contributions in this field of Catholic thought.

---

[11] *Compendium iuris publici ecclesiastici*, by Fr. Lawrence R. Sotillo, S.J., 2nd edition (Santander: Editorial Sal Terrae, 1951), pp. 367.

From Canada we have received one of the most valuable contemporary books on the nature of sacred theology. It is *La nature de la théologie d'après Melchior Cano*, by the Oblate Father Eugène Marcotte.[12] Because of Cano's unique influence in the development of the concept of sacred theology, any successful study of his teaching on this subject is bound to be of immense value for an understanding of the notion and function of the sacred science. Fr. Marcotte's monograph is eminently successful. It is something which no future student of the nature of sacred theology can afford to neglect.

For those who are interested in the study of the encyclical *Humani generis*, by far the most useful commentary which has appeared to date is the symposium published by the editors of *Euntes docete*, and which appeared as the combined first two 1951 issues of that distinguished review.[13] The best of the many good articles in this symposium are Msgr. Parente's "Struttura e significato storico-dottrinale dell'enciclica" and Msgr. Piolanti's "De symbolismo et ubiquismo eucharistico a Pio XII proscripto."[14] The former names many of the printed works in which errors mentioned and reproved by the encyclical are contained or at least favored. The latter gives long excerpts from the mimeographed notes which were circulated among the laity and the clergy of France prior to the appearance of *Humani generis*, and which contained manifest and vicious errors about the Blessed Sacrament.

Incidentally, one of the most melancholy phases of recent ecclesiastical history is and will always have been the story of the protests made against Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's mention of these unpublished notes in his article "La nouvelle théologie: ou va-t-elle?" which appeared in the review *Angelicum*.[15] These unpublished notes were widely circulated and did a great deal of harm. One would have expected that the theologian who called attention to their existence and to their powerful influence for evil would have gained the gratitude of all the men whose lives are devoted to the cause of Christian truth. Yet when Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange attacked them, he found himself subject to literary attacks which ranged from the sententiously silly to the merely peevish in tone.

---

[12] *La nature de la théologie d'après Melchior Cano*, by Eugène Marcotte, O.M.I. (Ottawa: Éditions de l'Université, 1949), pp. 217.

[13] *In litteras encyclicas "Humani generis" Pii PP. XII commentarium*, by teachers of the Pontifical University of Propaganda Fide (Rome: Editiones Urbanianae, 1951), pp. 253.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 23-45; 56-71.

[15] *Angelicum*, XXIII (1946).

Men like those who wrote and distributed the type of notes cited and stigmatized by Msgr. Piolanti have always regarded and will always regard any objection voiced against their tenets in the name of Catholic orthodoxy as a particularly odious sort of personal foul in what they seem to consider as the game of theology. It was only to be expected that they would react vigorously against Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's article. What was definitely not expected, however, was that good and competent theologians could be beguiled into expressing even a half-hearted approval of their stand. The reaction to the famous article in *Angelicum* would seem to indicate the need for a new and accurate explanation of what actually constitutes the honor of sacred theology, an explanation which will point up the fact that a writer who objects to certain teachings on the grounds that they are not in accord with Catholic dogma need not be treated discourteously.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE PREACHER

But let me remind you once again that whether he likes it or not, every priest preaches himself; his work in the pulpit is the outcome of all that has gone before. He is then, what he has done, thought, said and prayed; every experience of his priestly life has contributed to the formation of his mind; it *is* his mind, his subconsciousness being simply the permanence of the past in the present—a state of mind which is the principle and source of his spoken word.

—Fr. Ferdinand Valentine, O.P., in *The Art of Preaching* (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1952), p. 25.

Answers to Questions

DEVOTIONAL ELECTRIC LIGHTS

Question: If the director of a shrine sends out letters asking the recipients to contribute $1.00 each to pay for a *devotional light* that will be burned before the shrine for a week, does he satisfy his obligation if he has a small electric light turned on for the stipulated period of time?

Answer: I do not believe that the director who adopts this procedure fulfils his obligation in justice. The average Catholic, when he receives a promise that a devotional light will be burned for his intention, understands the promise as referring to a vigil light made of wax or of some similar consumable material, such as paraffin. Hence, the procedure described in the question would seem to be equivalent to taking money under false pretenses.

Moreover, the use of electrical lights in place of votive candles is certainly contrary to the very symbolism of the devotional act involved, which calls for the consuming of the light as an expression of self-consecration. Decrees of the Holy See can also be cited which condemn the use of electric lights as an element of sacred services (Cf. Wuest-Mullaney, *Matters Liturgical* [New York, 1944], n. 62). A detailed series of regulations for the churches of Rome, issued in 1932, is very emphatic on this point; and although they do not *per se* bind outside of Rome, they surely indicate the mind of the Church on this point (Cf. Collins, *Church Edifice and its Appointments* [Westminster, Md., 1946], pp. 133 ff.). The late Bishop Shaughnessy, S.M., of Seattle, writing on "The Decline of the Supernatural" in the pages of this *Review* several years ago, asserted: "As their contribution to the desupernaturalizing movement, our religious-goods houses place upon the market electrical contraptions that, it is true, obviate the smoke and the grease of some most unseemly 'shrines' by replacing with a garish electric light the holocaust of a candle that in its vigil would consume itself in honor of its Creator . . . Surely, as shrines go, we have here the absolute nadir of the spiritual and the supernatural" (*AER*, 98, 6 [June, 1938], 505).

THE NEW RULES ON FAST AND ABSTINENCE

Question 1: Does the new ruling regarding the amount of food allowed at the breakfast and the collation on a fast day permit a person who up to the present has used the "2 and 8 ounce" norm to take more now at these two meals? I have met some priests who hold that the "relative norm" now promulgated by our bishops is intended merely to extend the obligation of fasting to many who were unable to fast according to the previous norm. Hence, these priests argue, those who were previously able to observe the "2 and 8 ounce" rule are still bound to this same restriction on a fast day (provided their health and working conditions are the same as they were previously), while those who hitherto could not fast in this rigorous manner are now obliged to conform to the "relative norm" if they can do so without serious detriment to their health or work.

Question 2: In determining the amount of food permitted at the two smaller meals (which is relative to the amount taken at the principal meal) must one regulate it each day by the quantity taken at the main repast on that particular day or may one determine it in relation to the amount he customarily eats at his chief meal?

Question 3: Under the present norm what amount would constitute grave matter in the violation of the law of fasting?

Question 4: What, in detail, is now permitted on days of fast and abstinence to persons below the age of 21 or over the age of 59?

Answer 1: Beginning with Lent of the current year, the bishops of the United States have generally conceded to their people the right to use what is known as the "relative norm" in determining the amount of food that may be taken at the two smaller meals allowed on a fast day, the breakfast and the collation (lunch or supper). The characteristic feature of the relative norm is that it does not lay down a definite quantity of food as permissible at these two meals, as was the case with the absolute norm hitherto quite commonly imposed (two ounces for breakfast and eight ounces for the collation), but determines the amount in accordance with the requirements of the particular individual. The state of his health, the nature of his occupation and the demands of his appetite are to be taken into consideration, and on this basis he may eat as much at breakfast and the collation as is necessary to maintain his strength and to enable him to perform his daily task without grave inconvenience, provided these two meals contain no meat and in quantity do not equal in their combined weight a full meal. One who limits himself to one full meal and two other meals of this type on a fast day truly fulfils the ecclesiastical precept of fasting. It is to be noted that the bishops do not say that a person *may* eat at the two minor meals as much as he eats at the principal meal; they merely say that he *may not* eat as much at these two combined as will equal a full meal. For the very essence of a fast day is that only one full meal be taken. Hence, if a person can be sufficiently nourished at the two minor meals by a considerably smaller quantity than constitutes a full meal for him, he is obliged to restrict himself to this amount.

The important phrase in the bishops' instruction is found in the statement that one may take at the two minor meals "sufficient to maintain strength." The priests referred to by our questioner seem to have drawn their strict conclusion from this phrase somewhat after this manner of argumentation: "If in the past a person has been able to go through Lent and the other fast days of the year and to remain capable of fulfilling his daily duties on the '2 and 8 ounce' norm, this same amount is sufficient to maintain his strength now, presuming his physical condition and his required labor remain the same. Hence, for such a person the present relative norm allows only as much as the former absolute norm, two ounces for breakfast and eight ounces for the collation."

However, I believe that this mode of argumentation is erroneous because of too rigorous an interpretation of the phrase "sufficient to maintain strength." There is an explanation of these words in the report on fast and abstinence submitted to the bishops at their annual meeting in November, 1952 (and evidently accepted by them) in the longer phrase "sufficient for a person to do his daily work without undue inconvenience." Now, I am firmly convinced that the great majority of those Catholics who in past limited themselves to the "2 and 8 ounce" diet (there were not many of them in recent years) actually suffered "undue inconvenience" in the form of headaches, languor, nervous strain, etc., at least if they were occupied with regular tasks (even of a light nature) demanding attention and diligence for six or seven hours a day. Hence, while it is true that one who can find enough nourishment in the "2 and 8 ounce" diet to do his daily work "without undue inconvenience" must be satisfied with this amount, it certainly does not follow that the mere fact that a person was able to perform his work and to survive Lent in past on this meagre allowance proves that he did so "without undue inconvenience" and that consequently he may eat no more under the relative norm. On the contrary, I believe, most of these good people may now, without any scruple, notably increase the amount they take at breakfast and the collation on fast days with the assurance that they are properly observing the Church law. This, I believe, is a reasonable interpretation of the sane and considerate ruling of the American hierarchy.

On the other hand, I believe that there are many other persons who in past justly regarded themselves as excused from the law of fasting but who are now bound to observe it by a conscientious application of the relative norm. I refer particularly to "white collar workers" and professional persons, such as doctors, lawyers and priests.

If called on to give a practical explanation of the law of fasting which now prevails, in a manner intelligible to the average Catholic, I would say that it embraces these three factors: (a) No meat except at the principal meal. (b) No solid food outside the three permitted meals, except a very slight quantity (such as a cracker) a couple of times a day in conjunction with a drink, *ne potus noceat*. Liquids (including milk and "straight" fruit juices, but not milk shakes, malted milk, soup, and similar thick liquids) are allowed as often as one wishes. (c) A notable reduction of the quantity of food to which one is accustomed at the two minor meals. I would say that if the combined amount of these meals is brought down to two-thirds of one's usual fare, the law of fasting is sufficiently safeguarded for the average person.

Let us take a definite case. A person is accustomed to take about 24 ounces of solid food for dinner, 8 ounces for breakfast, 16 ounces for lunch or supper. If now on a fast day he reduces the quantity of these last two meals to 6 and 12 ounces respectively, I am of the opinion that he is obeying the law. Let it be well understood that this is only an example. I have no intention of introducing another absolute norm.

In explaining this matter to the laity, it is always well to point out the Church's purpose in imposing the obligation of fasting—the atonement for sin, the fostering of self-denial, etc., and, in Lent, the imitation of Our Lord's fast in the desert for forty days.

Answer 2: In determining the amount allowed at the two minor meals, a person may surely accept as the quantity of a full meal the amount of food he usually takes, not necessarily the amount he has taken or intends to take on each particular day. Indeed, one who takes his principal meal in the evening can never be sure how much he will be inclined to eat on that occasion on any particular day, and how much will be served. If the relative norm called for an adaptation to each day, the absurd consequence would follow that in order to avoid sin one would sometimes have to force himself to eat more than he is inclined to eat so that his dinner will measure up to the combined amount of the two previous meals.

Answer 3: When the absolute norm was in use, theologians generally held that four ounces of food in excess of what one was entitled to take on a fast day constituted sufficiently grave matter to render one guilty of mortal sin (Cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938] II, n. 974). Evidently, under the relative norm the amount for grave matter would be relative. I would suggest tentatively that one-third of a full meal, taken either outside of mealtime or in addition to the amount reasonably permitted at the two minor repasts, would suffice to constitute grave matter in the violation of the fast. Thus, the person described above, toward the end of the first answer, would commit a mortal sin on a fast day by eating eight ounces of solid food in addition to what is permitted to him. It should be noted that this refers to the law of *fasting*. The illicit eating of meat in violation of the law of *abstinence* would be rendered mortally sinful by a much smaller amount—certainly, two ounces or more (Merkelbach, *op. cit.*, n. 975).

Answer 4: As far as the Church law of *fasting* is concerned, persons under 21 or over 59 are entirely free; hence, with due regard to the divine law forbidding gluttony, they may eat as often as they wish and as much as they wish every day of the year. As far as the law of *abstinence* is concerned, persons under 21 (and over 7, provided they have attained the use of reason) or over 59 are subject to the following prescriptions: (a) On days of complete abstinence (all Fridays, Ash Wednesdays, the Vigils of Christmas and of the Assumption, Holy Saturday until noon) they may not eat meat at all. (b) On days of partial abstinence (Wednesdays and Saturdays of the Ember seasons, the Vigils of Pentecost and of All Saints') they may eat meat only once, at the principal meal. (c) On days of mere fast—the weekdays of Lent not included under (a) and (b)—they may eat meat as often as they wish.

Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

ORGAN REGULATIONS

Question: We are about to purchase a new organ for our church. Since we cannot afford to spend a large sum of money I would like to know the regulations concerning the so called "electric" organ.

Answer: In 1938 the Congregation of Sacred Rites went on record as disapproving certain "electric" organs since they did not fulfill the liturgical law. However, early in 1950 the same Congregation stated that the electric organs, though still imperfect from a liturgical standpoint were permissible. Since the price is so attractive and within the reach of many small parishes, it is important to note the text of the Congregation of Sacred Rites on this particular instrument.

> It is superfluous to note that the organ is given a function of importance in the sacred liturgy and that to make one, even a small one involves great expense. Therefore in these times companies manufacturing musical instruments have devised electronic organs, which are altogether inferior to pneumatic organs but offer notable advantages in their construction and use.
>
> Considering these facts, the Congregation of Sacred Rites, although it confirms the fact that the old pipe organ is to be preferred in all functions, as more in conformity with liturgical needs, nevertheless does not prohibit the use of electric organs. For this reason this Sacred Congregation, although it knows that this type of organ, before it can be a worthy substitute for the pipe

organ, must be perfected and improved (which it is exhorted that these companies do), nevertheless leaves to the judgment of Bishops and other Ordinaries, after hearing the opinion of the diocesan council for promoting sacred music, to permit in individual cases, when a pipe organ cannot be easily provided, the use of the electric organ, adding those changes which the above mentioned diocesan council may suggest.

ORATIO IMPERATA

Question: The Ordo called for a commemoration *pro papa* on March 2 and again on March 12. We have that same *imperata* in our diocese. Do we have to do anything further?

Answer: On the anniversary of the Pope's election and coronation, the prayer ordered by the Bishop as an *imperata* is omitted as such and becomes a common commemoration.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE MASS

Question: Kindly give me a concise distinction between a private and public Mass.

Answer: Some writers refer to the High Mass as a public Mass and the low Mass as a private Mass. Again, Masses offered in chapels, semi-public oratories or even in parish churches but for a private congregation or a small group are often classified as private Masses. The public Mass or the stational Mass was one in which the whole Roman Church participated. This would be something like our parish Mass today which would be considered a public Mass and the non-official Mass as a private Mass (Augustine, *Liturgical Law*).

ATHANASIAN CREED

Question: On a Sunday, when there is a commemoration of a double reduced to a simple is the *Quicumque* to be recited?

Answer: The Athanasian Creed is said on minor Sundays after Epiphany and Pentecost when the Sunday office is as in the Psalter and there is no commemoration of a double office or an octave occurring. However, it is recited on the feast of Trinity (Callewaert, *De breviarii romani liturgia*).

FLOWERS ON THE ALTAR

Question: Recently two questions arose about the use of flowers on the altar. Are we permitted to place flowers on the altar during Lent? May potted plants be used on the altar when the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is being offered?

Answer: The general rule is that flowers are not permitted on the altar during Advent and Lent when the Mass of the Sunday or Ferial is being read. Naturally, the regulation about flowers for a Requiem Mass remains regardless of the season of the liturgical year.

Many of the liturgical authors maintain that potted plants should never be used on the altar. These same authors have no objection to potted flowers being placed on the floor of the sanctuary near the altar. They offer two objections, the first being a practical one, namely that the pot may contain worms and insects, which would be out of place at the altar. The other objection is of a symbolic value. The fresh cut flower has more of the self-sacrificing idea than a growing potted flower.

ROSARY DEVOTIONS

Question: A number of our good parishioners here say the Rosary aloud every morning of the week after the 6:30 Mass. They begin it immediately after the priest leaves the altar. Am I wrong in considering it improper to do this?

Answer: Such a devotion should be encouraged. As long as the good people do not insist on reciting the beads during the offering of Holy Mass, they should be encouraged in their devotion to Our Blessed Lady. If the priest who has just finished Holy Mass could spare the time, I am sure, it would be a great incentive and boost to the people if he would join them in the recitation of the Rosary.

STATIONS OF THE CROSS

Question: To gain the indulgences attached to the devotion of the Stations of the Cross must one say fourteen Paters, Aves and Glorias, and conclude with a prayer for the intention of the Holy Father?

Answer: Certain conditions have been set down for the gaining of the indulgence attached to the Way of the Cross.

(1) We are to meditate at least in a general way and according to the best of our ability on the Passion of Our Lord. (2) In so far as it is possible we are to move from one station to the other. In the public recitation of these prayers it is sufficient that the Priest accompanied by two acolytes move from station to station, for otherwise there would be utter confusion. (3) The visitation of the fourteen stations should be one continuous act without any notable interruption. One may interrupt the devotion to hear Mass or go to Confession or Holy Communion. (4) No vocal prayers are required during or after the devotion for the intention of the Holy Father. (Wuest-Mullaney, *Matters Liturgical.*)

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

PRAYER AND HOLINESS

It is impossible to speak of holiness at all, in fact, without envisaging the deep personal relation of man to God in charity and the spontaneous movement of the soul which springs from it. Now it is the spirit of prayer which is the animating force of this movement; and by this spirit of prayer we mean a habitual disposition due, in last analysis, to the presence of the Holy Spirit. For that reason prayer takes it place as the integrating factor in the spiritual life; it lies at the source of all progress and growth in holiness; and other activities must find their place in a movement whose objective is conscious union with God.

Father James, O.F.M.Cap., in *The Secret of Holiness* (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1952), pp. 113 f.

Analecta

The Encyclical on the occasion of the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Chalcedon[1] contains a review of the unfortunate events which made the convocation of that Council necessary, together with a restatement of the true Faith and an invitation to the dissidents to return to the fold of the One Shepherd.

Various Decretal Letters have to do with canonizations. Thus, the honors of the altar are decreed for Blessed Mary Wilhelmina Emily de Rodat, founder of the Congregation of Sisters of the Holy Family.[2] They are also awarded to Blessed Bartholomea Capitanio, foundress of the Congregation of Sisters of Charity,[3] and to Blessed Vincenza Gerosa.[4] To Blessed Vincent Mary Strambi also they are given,[5] and to Blessed Mary Goretti.[6]

The proclamation and the Homily of the Holy Father on the occasion of the solmen canonization of Blessed Anthony M. Gianelli, Francis Xavier M. Bianchi, and Ignatius a Laconi are also reported.[7]

Several Apostolic Constitutions, making changes in the territory and rank of various ecclesiastical circumscriptions, attest to the constant development of the Church. Thus, the Vicariate Apostolic of Abidjan in French West Africa is divided and a new Prefecture Apostolic of Bouaké created.[8] The Prefectures Apostolic of Garoua in the Cameroons and of Fort Lamy in French Equatorial Africa are redistricted and a new Prefecture Apostolic, Moundou, is erected in French Equatorial Africa.[9] The new diocese of Dodge City is erected in a portion of the territory of the diocese of Wichita.[10] A new diocese of Sambalpur is also erected in India in territory taken from the dioceses of Calcutta, Ranchi, and Nagpur.[11] A new Prefecture Apostolic of Isangi is erected in the Belgian Congo in territory taken from the Vicariates Apostolic of Lisala, Coquilhatville, Basankusu, and Stanleyville.[12]

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 43 (1951), 625 (Sept. 8, 1951).

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 644 (April 23, 1950).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 689 (May 18, 1950).

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 699 (May 18, 1950).

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 758 (June 11, 1950).

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 817 (June 25, 1950).

[7] *Ibid.*, pp. 753, 754 (Oct. 21, 1951).

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 654 (May 17, 1951).

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 656 (May 17, 1951).

Similarly, the Vicariate Apostolic of Brazzaville in French Equatorial Africa is divided and a new Vicariate Apostolic of Fort Rousset is erected.[13] The Prefecture Apostolic of Chowchih is made a diocese.[14] The new ecclesiastical province of Seattle is created[15] and the new diocese of Yakima is erected in territory taken from the dioceses of Seattle and Spokane.[16] The diocese of Juneau is set up in a portion of the territory of the Vicariate Apostolic of Alaska.[17]

A new Prefecture Apostolic, Kole, in the Belgian Congo is erected in territory of the Vicariate Apostolic of Leopoldville.[18] The new diocese of St. Jerome is created in territory taken from the Archdioceses of Montreal and Ottawa and from the diocese of Mont-Laurier.[19] A new diocese is likewise created under the title St. Anne Pocatier in territory taken from the Archdiocese of Quebec, to which it is made suffragan.[20]

Apostolic Letters grant the title and privileges of a Minor Basilica to the church of the Immaculate Conception in the city of Batangas in the diocese of Lipa in the Philippines.[21] Our Lady of Hope, called locally "de Radice," is proclaimed Patron of the diocese of Zamora in Mexico.[22] The cathedral of Como is also made a Minor Basilica,[23] as are the parish church of St. Margaret in the city of Santa Margherita Ligure, in the diocese of Chiavari,[24] and that of Our Lady in the city of Portugalete in the diocese of Vila Real.[25]

Similar honors are also granted to the church of Our Lady in the town of La Guerche de Bretagne in the archdiocese of

---

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 657 (May 19, 1951).

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 660 (June 14, 1951).

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 663 (June 14, 1951).

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 710 (Dec. 21, 1950).

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 712 (May 10, 1951).

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 714 (June 23, 1951).

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 716 (June 23, 1951).

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 719 (June 23, 1951).

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 828 (June 14, 1951).

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 830 (June 23, 1951).

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 833 (June 23, 1951).

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 665 (Feb. 13, 1948).

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 666 (Sept. 25, 1950).

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 668 (Jan. 18, 1951).

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 669 (Jan. 26, 1951).

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 671 (Feb. 27, 1951).

Rennes in France[26] and that of Our Lady under the title of the Assumption in the city of Lugo in the diocese of Imola.[27]

By Apostolic Letters, likewise, the new Statutes of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem were approved and the Order was recognized as a "juridical" person.[28] The same type of document was used to declare Our Lady, under the title of the Immaculate Conception, Principal Patron of the City of Zamora in Mexico.[29] By such Letters, too, an Apostolic Internuntiature was established in the Republic of Liberia.[30]

Various Letters are published. By one of them Cardinal Schuster, the Archbishop of Milan, was named Legate to the Italian Eucharistic Congress at Assisi.[31] Another named Cardinal Micara Legate to the tenth French Eucharistic Congress at Nîmes.[32] Still another was directed to Cardinal Jorio on the occasion of his sixtieth anniversary in the priesthood.[33]

Another Letter, to the Hierarchy of Poland, recalls that five years before they had solemnly rededicated the Nation to the Blessed Virgin, whom they had always honored so highly throughout the course of history. Though times continue to be bad, there is always hope that as in the past she has helped the Nation and protected it so she will in the future.[34] A similar Letter to the Hierarchy in Czecho-Slovakia laments the sad condition of the Church there.[35] A Letter is, likewise, directed to Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago, presiding over the ninth national congress on Catechetical Instruction.[36] Cardinal Tedeschini is similarly named Legate to Fatima.[37] Another Letter is directed to Archbishop Fietta, Apostolic Nuncio in Argentina, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his episcopal consecration.[38] Still another names Cardinal Caro Rodriguez, Archbishop of Santiago del Chile Legate to the tenth Chilean Eucharistic Congress in Valparaiso.[39]

---

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 724 (Mar. 12, 1951).

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 726 (April 13, 1951).

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 722 (Sept. 14, 1949).

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 772 (Oct. 28, 1949).

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 774 (July 12, 1951).

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 672 (Aug. 2, 1951).

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 728 (May 24, 1951).

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 729 (Sept. 10, 1951).

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 775 (Sept. 1, 1951).

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 768 (Oct. 28, 1951).

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 778 (Sept. 14, 1951).

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 780 (Sept. 24, 1951).

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 781 (Sept. 25, 1951).

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 782 (Sept. 26, 1951).

The Holy Father addressed by radio the Eucharistic Congress at Assisi,[40] and that at Nîmes.[41] He also addressed the French fathers of families who came to Rome on a pilgrimage.[42] Another address was directed to the Carmelite teachers.[43] The Holy Father also delivered an exhortation to those who had gathered in Rome for the International Congress of Nuns engaged in the education of young girls.[44] He likewise spoke to those who were in Rome for the general congress of the Catholic Apostolate of the Laity.[45] Another address was directed to the Spanish envoy.[46]

Four radio addresses were delivered in late September and early October. One was to the Swiss Eucharistic Congress at Einsiedeln,[47] another to the participants in the Eucharistic Congress on the island of Madagascar at Tananarive,[48] another on the occasion of the Fatima ceremonies,[49] and the fourth to the Chilean Eucharistic Congress.[50] The Holy Father also addressed by radio those who were damaged by the flood of the Po.[51]

The Convention of the Italian Catholic Union of Midwives, held in Rome, was also addressed by the Holy Father,[52] as was the Convention of the "*Fronte della Famiglia*" and the association of large families.[53] Another address was directed to the Finnish envoy.[54]

The Sacred Consistorial Congregation announces the appointment of Most Rev. John Francis O'Hara, former Bishop of Buffalo, as Archbishop of Philadelphia.[55]

An Apostolic Brief, dated November 27, 1951, nominates Most Rev. Gerald O'Hara, Archbishop-Bishop of Savannah-Atlanta, Apostolic Nuncio to Ireland.[56]

The Sacred Congregation for Religious announces a decree establishing a "*studium*" in the Congregation.[57]

---

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 673 (Sept. 9, 1951).

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 744 (Sept. 30, 1951).

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 730 (Sept. 18, 1951).

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 734 (Sept. 23, 1951).

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 738 (Sept. 13, 1951).

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 784 (Oct. 14, 1951).

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 792 (Nov. 13, 1951).

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 795 (Sept. 30, 1951).

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 797 (Sept. 30, 1951).

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 800 (Oct. 13, 1951).

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 802 (Oct. 14, 1951).

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 860 (Nov. 18, 1951).

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 835 (Oct. 29, 1951).

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 855 (Nov. 26, 1951).

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 854 (Nov. 18, 1951).

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 864 (Nov. 23, 1951).

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 879 (Nov. 27, 1951).

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 806 (Oct. 23, 1951).

The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda Fide announces the transfer of the See of Port Augusta to Port Pirie in Australia.[58] It also announces a change in the boundaries of the territory of the Vicariate Apostolic of Mandalay, the Prefecture Apostolic of Bhamo, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Keng-Tung.[59] It likewise announces that the Vicariate Apostolic of Vinh is entrusted to the diocesan clergy.[60]

The Sacred Congregation of Rites announces the decree for the introduction of the cause for beatification of the Servant of God, Joseph Toniolo, the famous lay professor of Sociology,[61] and another for the introduction of the cause for beatification of the Servant of God, Joseph Freinademetz, S.V.D.[62] Another decree for the introduction of a cause for beatification concerns the Servant of God, Alphonsus Mary Fusco, a priest, the founder of the Institute of Sisters of St. John Baptist.[63] Still another decree concerns introduction of the cause for beatification of the Servant of God, Mary Helen Bettini, the foundress of the Institute of Daughters of Divine Providence.[64]

The Pontifical Biblical Commission presents the plan for examination of candidates for academic degrees in Sacred Scripture.[65]

The Sacred Penitentiary announces that the prayer to Our Lady under the title of the Assumption is enriched with indulgences,[66] as is that to be recited by the associates of Catholic Action.[67]

The Sacred Roman Rota announces a definitive sentence in a case *de bono prolis* in which it discusses the distinction between *jus coniugale* and *usus juris*.[68] It likewise cites by edict Isidore Jacobs in connection with the case, Damasso-Jacobs.[69]

Most Rev. John M. McNamara, Auxiliary Bishop of Washington, is announced as having been appointed *Assistente al*

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 808 (June 7, 1951).

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 809 (June 14, 1951).

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 865 (June 14, 1951).

[61] *Ibid.*, p. 681 (Jan. 7, 1951).

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 684 (June 22, 1951).

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 866 (June 22, 1951).

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 868 (July 27, 1951).

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 747 (June 20, 1951).

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 870 (Nov. 17, 1951).

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 871 (Nov. 17, 1951).

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 872 (Feb. 23, 1951).

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 877 (Nov. 23, 1951).

Soglio Pontificio,[70] as were Most Rev. Daniel J. Gercke, Bishop of Tucson,[71] and Most Rev. Mariano S. Garriga, Bishop of Corpus Christi.[72]

The Secretariate of State announces the appointments of:

Protonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium.

Feb. 27, 1951, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John Creagh and Joseph McGlinchey of the Archdiocese of Boston, and Rt. Rev. Msgr. Louis Kemphues of the diocese of Nashville.

Domestic Prelates

Aug. 18, 1949, Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John A. Donovan, Alfred A. Herbert, Joseph V. Pfeffer, Archibald M. Stitt, of the Archdiocese of Detroit.

April 14, 1951, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Claudius Gobet, of the diocese of Ogdensburg.

May 26, 1951, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph Dougherty, of the Archdiocese of Seattle.

Secret Chamberlains

March 22, 1951, Very Rev. Msgr. Francis Juras, of the Archdiocese o Boston.

Sept. 3, 1951, Very Rev. Msgr. John Zarrilli, of the diocese of Duluth.

Secret Chamberlains in Cape and Sword

May 25, 1951, Messrs. John McShain and James McGranery, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

---

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 688 (Mar. 30, 1948).

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 688 (May 7, 1951).

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 688 (Apr. 14, 1951).

Book Reviews

Depth Psychology, Morality and Alcoholism. (Reprinted from *Proceedings* of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Catholic Theological Society of America, Washington, D. C., June 26-28, 1950.) By John C. Ford, S.J., A.M., LL.B., S.T.D. Weston, Mass.: Weston College, 1951.

Part I, "Depth Psychology and Morality," is an attempt by the author to summarize Freudian psychology, especially what it has to say about the influence of unconscious psychic life on human freedom. It is also a collection of statements by psychologists and psychiatrists who are very critical of, or reject, much, if not most, of what Freud has said or done. The author's own position is in general equally unsympathetic with and disparagingly critical of Freudian psychology. In particular Fr. Ford rejects the implication that unconscious motivation "eliminates or notably impairs the freedom of our everyday deliberate decisions."

It seems to this reviewer that Part I of the monograph is liable to a number of serious criticisms by a psychologist.

First, the summary of Freudian psychology is second or third hand, mostly from Catholic critics of Freud. Freud himself is quoted only once.

Second, this part of the monograph creates the false impression that a lesser proportion of psychologists than psychiatrists accept unconscious motivation as a fact. Practically all psychologists nowadays, even if they question or reject many, even most, of Freud's explanations of facts, do accept what is revealed again and again in clinical and even experimental situations: much of our past (emotional as well as cognitive) experience is stored; we are not normally aware of its presence in us; we can be made aware of it by special techniques; it does, sometimes at least, influence (and at other times even determine) our behavior. Depth psychology is not necessarily Freudian psychology.

Third, the paper makes no mention of such basic automatic unconscious activities, "mechanisms" they are called in psychiatry, as dissociation, identification, displacement, conversion, projection, regression.

With some inconsistency of viewpoint here and there, this part of the monograph gives the impression that for a Catholic "normal" and "abnormal" must be distinct categories something like, say, oysters and radio tubes. The psychiatric point of view is actually very useful for a Catholic moralist, and sound; the various forms of "abnormal" behavior are extreme exaggerations or distortions of the experiences or the forms of behavior (impulsive, emotional, cognitive, and appetitive) that are natural, and normal in the sense that they are to be found in everyone.

Finally, Part I gives the impression also that every act of behavior must be in a clear cut way *either* conscious *or* unconscious, *either* free *or* determined, *either* normal *or* abnormal. As a matter of fact moral theologians themselves insist that many an act of human behavior is so much *more or less* abnormal, *more or less* unconscious, and *more or less* impulsively or compulsively determined that only God can judge with certitude how free and responsible a particular person in a particular act was.

It seems to this reviewer useful and reasonable for a philosophy of psychology to protest, as Fr. Ford does, against the Freudian exaggeration that *all* behavior is unconsciously *determined,* and to protest against the behavioristic, materialistic determinist's assertion that our awareness of self-determination is *always* illusory. But the moral theologian, it seems to me, might be more usefully occupied with investigating, as Fr. Ford does in Part II, "Morality and Alcoholism," what a dynamic clinical psychology has to contribute to understanding and dealing with behavior that is *more or less* impulsively, unconsciously, automatically influenced or determined. Such behavior is obviously not culpable or is less culpable than the so-easily-described conscious, free, voluntary actions, "where there is no emotional involvement." As a matter of fact, it is extremely doubtful if there are in a particular man actually as he *is,* any such acts "where there is no emotional involvement." The implication that there are many pure acts of man by intellect and will alone is perhaps what Fr. Rimbaud protests against as "the pseudo-psychology of the treatise *De Actibus Humanis.*"

Part II, "Morality and Alcoholism," makes much more sense to this reviewer, because what seems to be the author's clinical experience with alcoholics gives him some sympathetic understanding of the compulsive and dynamic character of human behavior in alcoholism. Part II is in fact a distinct contribution to the literature of moral theology on alcoholism.

However, this reviewer feels that Part I, unfortunately, will serve largely only to deepen theological prejudice against the study and use of psychiatry, even what is morally good. The fact needs stressing among clerics that not *all* psychiatry nor even all psychoanalysis is an "intellectual swindle."

As a final thought, possibly some day, the widespread and even fanatical acceptance of psychoanalysis by both physician and patient will be explained as due to the mechanisms of depth psychology, especially the mechanism of suggestion. Suggestion once had many scientifically trained men convinced Mesmerists.

HENRY R. BURKE, S.S.

FIGHTING ADMIRAL. THE STORY OF DAN CALLAGHAN. By Francis X. Murphy. New York: Vantage Press, 1952. Pp. 208. $3.00.

The United States Navy is developing a noteworthy Catholic tradition. Fr. Francis Murphy appraised that fact when he was serving as chaplain to the students of the United States Naval Academy. He has now contributed to that tradition by an autobiography of an officer in whom the virtues of religion and patriotism were blended.

Dan Callaghan came of fine Irish stock and lived with the singular purpose of being a *Catholic* naval officer. Among his confreres certain things set him apart: his fidelity to his religion, his refusal to drink or smoke, his athletic prowess, and his devotion to duty. He died in battle on Sept. 13, 1942 when, to disperse the heavy Jap fleet concentrating on Guadalcanal, he wheeled his cruisers through the enemy fire. The tide of battle changed but Admiral Callaghan died on his bridge.

The author takes his readers through the early days of the Callaghan family, the trials of Annapolis, on which Father Murphy writes familiarly, the attempted court martial, the days of Dan Callaghan as aide to President Roosevelt, and brings his work to a graceful climax in an epilogue summarizing the value of the battle of the Coral Sea.

This book might have conveyed its message in more abbreviated form. It is a fine volume to put into the hands of a midshipman or young Catholic who wants to make the Navy his career without compromising either his faith or his moral standards.

The author is now an army chaplain, which seems strange indeed because of his feeling for Navy tradition. All chaplains owe him a debt of gratitude for capturing and faithfully portraying the union of loyalties in a Catholic who, if he had lived, would have been as famous as Halsey or Leahy or Nimitz.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

FATHER LUIGI GENTILI AND HIS MISSION. By Denis Gwynn. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, Ltd., 1951. Pp. 268. 16/

This latest addition to Professor Gwynn's family of books on the theme of the Catholic Revival in England possesses that same admixture of scholarly research and popular appeal which mark his former works. It is equally as difficult to treat in a competent, thorough, yet limited manner, of a man as well as a Movement, and the reduction of factors involved in the critical treatment of either can be equally complex. Professor Gwynn again manifests that competent critical control of the historical milieu as well as of his subject which blend so well in the popular presentation of authentic historical information.

Denis Gwynn has presented the life of Father Gentili with a sensitive appreciation of the gradual development of personal sanctity in the individual, and one shares that feeling of constant suspense which overshadows the direction of any man's activities until death brings that fixation of activity which allows his every action to assume its proper perspective. One hesitates to decide during the early portion of the Life whether we have under consideration the case history of some emotionally unstable character with detectable neurotic traits, or the possessor of great and varied, but unfathomed talents which when moulded by the Holy Spirit, will be productive of that full realization of self which reaches out to sanctify one's fellow men and illumine the Church.

Indeed, it is not until the supreme test of his humility and obedience which was his preemptory removal from the Superiorship of the small Rosminian community at Prior Park that his personality takes on a definitive perspective for the reader. That event which presents Gentili as a solid and profoundly spiritual religious was a blessing for the Catholics of England. It marks his definitive break with the isolated experiences of his first sojourn in England. Henceforth, after his return to England, his field would be the Central District, so familiar to students of the Catholic Revival as the hive of constant activity, intellectual, liturgical, and missionary, the glory of the English Revival. Gentili's experiences in the Central District and in the industrial towns completed his development and his life.

Though a foreigner, he came to England with a great love for her people, though bearing preconceived ideas of them, their clergy, and the problems which faced them, ideas which were faulty in their estimation and poorly founded, and to which Gentili adhered until his vast experience in the industrial sections of England opened to his view an entirely new conceptualization of the problems which faced the clergy. From the dawn of that realization he became perhaps the best informed and understanding priest in England regarding the pastoral problems of the clergy, even as Wiseman was the best informed on her political problems.

Particular value is given the book because of the paucity of printed and available information on the life of one of the most prominent missionaries to England during the Catholic Revival. Some points of critical interest to the prevailing missionary situation with which England was faced during the period of the Revival might have been elaborated with deeper critical insight even at the risk of a more ponderous volume. We think such considerations would be justified from the purpose of the author to study the missionary work of Father Gentili.

One cannot but appreciate Dr. Gwynn's desire for "a much more adequate biography than this short study of his missionary work." We might conceivably be justified in wishing that Professor Gwynn, while he was about the task, had produced that more adequate biography.

ROMUALD A. DIBBLE, S.D.S.

GOD AND MAN AT YALE. By William F. Buckley, Jr. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951. Pp. xix+240. $3.50.

For a priest engaged in Newman Club work this book is easy to recommend. In the light of his own experience and difficulties he would be able to evaluate and employ much of the first hand information set down in the volume and be helped considerably by many of the criticisms so effectively articulated by the